The University of Chicago

The Influence of the Black Death on the English Monasteries

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY)

BY

PETER GEORGE MODE

A Private Edition
Distributed by
The University of Chicago Libraries
1916

3781
C53M
Dissertation
UNCLASSED

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

The University of Chicago

The Influence of the Black Death on the English Monasteries

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF CHURCH HISTORY)

BY

PETER GEORGE MODE

A Private Edition
Distributed by
The University of Chicago Libraries
1916

The Collegiate Press
GEORGE BANTA PUBLISHING COMPANY
MENASHA, WISCONSIN

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

The Monastery and the Community 1

CHAPTER II

The Decimation of the Clergy 11

CHAPTER III

The Monasteries and the Hundred Years' War 20

CHAPTER IV

Hard Times 34

CHAPTER V

The Financial Crisis 42

CHAPTER VI

The Decline of Discipline 60

Appendices

I. Appeals for Aid 74

II. Recognizances 89

III. Incumbents of Representative Monasteries 96

Bibliography 99

Index 105

Sacris Religiosorum domiciliis stragem magnam hoc malum invexit, extinctis disciplinae regularis magistris, et melioris notae Senioribus. Hinc coeperunt monastica sodalitia, praesertim mendicantium, quae eousque (sic) virtute, et doctrina florebant, tepescere et relaxari, tum deficientibus illustribus viris, tum relaxato miserandis calamitatibus regularis observantiae rigore, qui reparari non potuit ab adolenscentibus, et promiscua multitudine, quam absque necessario delectu receperunt, qui magis domos vacuas repleri quam deperditam disciplinam restaurare curaverunt.

LUCAS WADDING.

Annales Minorum, viii; 22.

CHAPTER I

The Monastery and the Community

To appreciate the full significance of a visitation such as the Black Death upon the monasteries of England, it is necessary to have an intelligent idea of the religious, social and economic relations existing between the monastery of the fourteenth century and its immediate environment. To one familiar with the changes in ideals and practice during the first eight hundred years of European monasticism, it is quite obvious that a pestilence in the fifth or sixth century would have been one thing, while a visitation of equal virulence in the fourteenth century was quite another. In its earlier stages monasticism was fairly successful in realizing its ideals of social and religious detachment. Even in its economic aspects the monastery was relatively self sufficient. Disaster might work havoc in the social organism as a whole and yet the monastery might emerge almost unscathed, at the most feeling the effect of a remote economic disturbance. By the fourteenth century, however, this could not be. The efforts of Cluniac, Cistercian, Carthusian, and Spiritual Franciscan to restore the early ideal of otherworldliness had proved unavailing. Enthusiasm for solitariness had given way again and again before the strong socializing pressure of complex civilization. Though checked temporarily by successive revivals, the monastery kept pushing its roots deeper and deeper into the social strata, thus merging its interests more and more with those of the community at large. Becoming an integral factor in the body politic, it entered sometimes only unconsciously and not always with due appreciation into its heritage of culture and economic advance. On the other hand, it had to pay its tribute to the periodic ills that affected the society of which it had become a part.

This identification of the monastery with the community is of such importance as to justify the consideration of a few details. Naturally it is the religious aspect of the situation that first merits attention. The monastery was essentially a religious house whose inmates devoted their lives to the worship of God, caring most scrupulously for the necessities of the inner life. Contact with the world was contamination. The monk's anxiety was not so much to save his fellow men as to save himself. If he threw doles to the unfortunates pleading at the convent gates, it was not because they as human beings ought to be relieved, but rather because he had a "calling and election," which through alms-

giving he would "make sure." Although on the one hand, as the votary of other-worldliness he was dead to the allurements of the world, yet on the other, as the victim of a perverted conception of religion he failed to regard himself as a servant ministering to the religious needs of his community. His religious activities motived, largely by selfish considerations were centered within the cloister. Little was done outside of the convent walls. The beautiful abbey church was a luxury where worship was enjoyed by few save the monks.

By the fourteenth century, however, the situation had changed. It would be gratifying to think that the monk had at last realized the social obligations of his religion, while retaining the fervor of his early spiritual-mindedness. Unfortunately such a conclusion is possible only by distorting the facts. He was little nearer the right view of religion, and to make matters worse he had lost his earlier sense of the unseen. In far too many ways he had become a man of the world. His monastery had become a part of the religious community in which he dwelt.

This in part was through the institution of the impropriated church, the revenues of which formed a substantial element in the endowments of almost every religious house. In founding a monastery the usual procedure was to secure a mortmain license empowering appropriations within the limit of a prescribed annual income. When this income proved insufficient it was not unusual to find relief in supplementary licenses. The abbey of Thornholm with its seven impropriated churches[1] may be cited as a moderate instance of a practice prevailing generally. To each of these churches the holding monastery attached an incumbent drawn almost invariably from the ranks of its inmates. Upon him devolved all responsibilities of the pastoral office for that specific portion of the diocese. He read the prayers, made some attempt at least to preach, and also administered the Sacraments. If his incumbency was not far from the cloister he was likely to be reasonably faithful in visitation during the week thus coming into intimate relations with the life of the community.

The manor chapel supplied another medium of communication between the monastery and the community. Although these chapels were often under the care of the Seculars, it is clear that sometimes, at least, the Regulars officiated in them.[2]

[1] Pat. R. July 23, 1347, p. 357.

[2] "Whereas in these manors and rectories there are chapels or oratories in which the abbot and keepers of these places can go to hear mass, the parish church being

Let the reader consult any reliable atlas[3] and he cannot fail to notice how many religious houses were massed in the south, central, and south-eastern counties of England. This implies that the monasteries were situated in relatively large numbers where the activities of the nation's life were centered. In bygone centuries many of these institutions enjoyed the coveted immunities of isolation. With the true instincts of the monk their founders chose islands removed from the mainland of life. But by and by the tides receded and the islands became mainland. Into Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, the pioneer monks came appropriating marshy lands subject to inundation.[4] Nobody protested against the occupation of what at that time seemed worthless. But by dint of ditch and dyke, some of the richest lands of England were reclaimed by them, and the attendant prosperity converted what was once marsh into one of the most thickly populated areas of the country.

It is also to be noted that many of the religious houses were on or near the seaboard. Alien monks in establishing themselves did not choose to go far inland. And the sea instead of isolating these, peculiarly exposed them to the vicissitudes of the nation's life.

A large number of the monasteries were located in the towns and cities. The following list while not exhaustive is sufficient to make this point clear. London had no fewer than 44 religious houses of various types, Lincoln 15, Boston 5, Stampford 9, Norwich 8, Great Yarmouth 6, King's Lynn 5, Northampton 12, Bedford 3, Reading 5, Worcester 8, Gloucester 9, Bristol 12, Winchester 14, Canterbury 12, Colchester 5, Plymouth 3, Exeter 11, Lynn 8, Oxford 15, York 24, and Carlisle 5. Of smaller towns with a single monastery, nunnery or hospital, the number is legion.

This connection of the religious houses with the centres of population is not to be interpreted as necessarily indicative of a desire on the part of these institutions to identify themselves with the larger interests of

distant," the abbot and convent of Westminster "pray for an indult to celebrate or cause to be celebrated masses in the same." (Papal Pet. I:506.)

"License to St. Mary's York, to build an oratory or chapel in their granges and manors in which divine offices may be celebrated." (Papal Letters I:487.)

Bordeseleye "was bound to find a chaplain to celebrate divine service in the chapel on Bentley Manor every Sunday, Wednesday, Friday, and in all Feast days." (Pat. R. Sept 15, 1332, p. 332.)

The Earl of Huntington seems to have secured papal authority to build a manor chapel to be cared for by the Regulars of the monastery endowed by himself. (Papal Pet I: pp. 50 and 192.)

[3] See Appendix Gasquet's Monastic Life, or Oxford Historical Atlas, in loco.

[4] Glastonbury and Ely are good examples. (Pat. R. Feb. 7, 1348, p. 28f.)

society. As a matter of history it is known that it was not the town that always attracted the religious house; in many instances at least it was the religious house that drew around it the nucleus of life that subsequently became the town. But in any case the connection was established and a large proportion of the monasteries was now subject to exposure through their proximity to the dwellings of the people.

For a limited area such as England, the significance of trade routes may be overrated. England's shore line is very extended; her ports in the fourteenth century were numerous; her roads inland were many; her towns and hamlets were relatively close.

Thus situated in towns by the sea and the roadside, the religious houses maintained not only religious but important social activities. In the earlier days the monk, intent upon his spiritual weal, had become a dispenser of alms. The monastery soon became a philanthropic institution. And such it continued to be. By the fourteenth century it was directing no small portion of its philanthropic activities through the channel of hospitals adapted to meet various forms of distress. These provided accommodation for the foundling, the pregnant, the leper, and the infirm. With their chaplain, their daily religious services, their rules and discipline, these houses were essentially religious houses, and must be so classed. They represent a worthy attempt to deal in mediaeval scientific fashion with phases of the problem of poverty. Yet the hospitals did not monopolize the task of relieving distress. The monastery continued to confer its corrodies upon deserving poor who were thus assured a permanent security against life's reverses.[5]

The chantry with its distribution of alms upon anniversary occasions was another point of contact between the monastery and the people. However, the number of chantries was quite small in the fourteenth century and some of these were attached to parish churches, rather than to religious houses. Although the monastery held the endowment fund, the conditions of bequest occasionally made it necessary to locate the chantry elsewhere than in the immediate neighborhood of the interested monastery. For these reasons one must guard against an overestimation of the chantry as a medium of contact between the religious houses and the community.

[5] The corrody may be defined as an annuity which took the form of a lodging in the monastery, an allowance of food, and of clothing. For illustrations see Pat. R. Oct. 3, 1341, p. 286; June 25, 1342, p. 479; June 8, 1343, p. 39; April 14, 1359, p. 196.

Hospitality supplied an added point of contact with the people. The monastery was at once a lodging for poor transients and a hostelry for the great magnates and royal retinue of the kingdom.[6]

Through the variety of its resources the monastery was affected remotely if not directly by the fortunes of almost every factor in its economic environment. As already noted above, one of the chief sources of its revenue was the impropriated church which turned in the tithes. These obviously rose and fell with the fluctuation of material prosperity within the parish. The same principle of economic dependence applied in the typical case of the hospital of St. Leonard's York, which "had a thrave of corn of every plow plowing in the counties of York, Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancaster."[7] But far more substantial than the impropriated tithes was the fruit of the vast landed holdings of the religious houses. These in part were devoted to sheep, horse, and cattle raising. Some idea of the magnitude of this industry may be gleaned from the thefts and impoundings that so often appear as a source of grievance. The abbot of Croyland lost 40 horses, 120 oxen, 300 cows, and 3000 sheep.[8] The abbot of Bynedon lost 100 oxen and 7000 sheep.[9] The bishop of Wincester was required by custom to devise to his successor "127 plow beasts, 1356 oxen, 4495 wethers, 4358 brood ewes, and 2697 hoggets."[10]

Other portions of their holdings, the monks farmed as manors. Sometimes they even farmed the manors of others. Occasionally they rented

[6] In Grymsby, Sandou was endowed "to entertain poor persons coming to the town." (Pat. R. Aug. 26, 1335, p. 212.) The chancellor and clerks of chancery "have made long stay in the abbey and borough"—hence the grant to St. Mary's York, of pavage for four years, "for the easement and honor of the chancellor and clerks . . . and of the magnates and others passing through the borough to the city to attend to their business in the king's places there." (Pat. R. Aug. 21, 1335 p. 162.) When the Earl of Arundel came to London "very frequently to treat of various matters for the king" he was lodged by royal order in the priory of St. Mary's Southewerk (Pat. R. Feb. 7, 1344, p. 189). Edward I frequently sojourned in Beaulieu. (V. C. H. Hants Vol. II: 142.) "By reason of the frequent coming to the priory of him and his household and magnates and others going with him to foreign parts" Edward III remitted to Suthwik, Southampton, a fee farm, and later made them a gift. (Pat. R. June 20, 1346, p. 125 and July 10, p. 153.)

[7] Pat. R. Feb. 16, 1355, p. 231.

[8] Pat. R. May 12, 1332, p. 247.

[9] Pat. R. Feb. 16, 1331, p. 131.

[10] Pat. R. Dec. 28, 1331, p. 231. It was from the Boulton hospital that Edward II bought the mutton for his private table though he left his son to pay the bill twenty years later. (Pat. R. March 10, 1336, p. 226.) For Christ's Canterbury, see Litterae Cant. 1:244.

their holdings and thereby relieved themselves of some of the many complicated problems of manorial administration.[11]

As agriculturalists and herdsmen, it is not surprising that the monks were interested in mill grinding and hidetanning.[12]

Fishing was another profitable industry. "Great part of the sustenance of the abbot and convent of Flaxele used to arise from the moiety of a Severn weir."[13] In contesting the rights to their fishing nets, these litigious monks maintained many a lawsuit. In one case at least they simplified the problem by undertaking to lay out the bailiffs with their fists.[14]

Considerable income seems to have been derived from fairs and market privileges.[15]

Another source of revenue was the "jurisdictional" rights enjoyed by the religious houses—"view of frank pledge, pleas of the crown and common pleas, jail delivery, execution of writs, fines, amercements, forfeitures, reformation of all trespasses and misdeeds."[16] These rights sometimes extended over broad areas; for instance, the abbot of St. Edmunds had the holding of fees for eight and one-half hundreds, and exclusive rights within the borough.[17] Such revenues, therefore, must have been considerable. Bergeveny reaped £10 perquisites of court

[11] On all see Pat. R. March 21, 1331, p. 99; Nov. 15, 1331, p. 195; Nov. 30, 1331, p. 222; July 1, 1355, p. 269; April 30, 1353, p. 464.

[12] The Abbot of Welbek paid £10 yearly for his mill. (Pat. R. June 26, 1359, p. 238.) In the assessment inventory for the abbey of Woubourn, there appear seven entries of "lands, meadows, and rents of mills." (Pat. R. Aug. 21, 1337, p. 492.) When the Henton Carthusians were having hard times, royal relief took the form of a license "to buy hides and sell for profit the tanned products." (Pat. R. April 14, 1359, p. 35.) Out of special regard for the prior of Carlisle, the king gave him "the bark of the trees used in tower and castle repair." (Cl. R. May 30, 1358, p. 463.)

[13] Pat. R. Oct. 20, 1358, p. 107.

[14] Cl. R. Nov. 9, 1331, p. 371. See also Cart. St. Peter, Gloucester: 155, 259; 2:73 and 79.

[15] The prior of St. Frideswide, Oxford, lost £1000 "being the toll and other profit of the fair." (Dec. 8, 1344, p. 423.) The rights of fair given by charter to St. Bartholomew formed "the great part of the sustenance of the canons." (Pat. R. July 2, 1364, p. 524.) Ramseye seems to have thought it a good bargain to pay a £50 fee for its market at St. Ives. (Pat. R. Feb. 4, 1331, p. 78.) It can therefore be understood why the abbots of Croyland and Abyndon were anxious to maintain their fair privileges, and also why the populace was determined to resist. (Pat. R. May 12, 1332, p. 246; April 20, 1353, p. 456. See also Hist. Monast. Abyndon 2:163.

[16] Pat. R. Feb. 1, 1366, p. 219.

[17] Pat. R. May 30, 1331, p. 123.

from its borough.[18] The bishop of Bath in one year derived 100 marks as fees of Court from his diocese.[19] Wayf alone was worth £1000 to the prior of Llanthony.[20]

Within the boroughs there were also substantial monastic incomes. It was here that the tenement rentals assumed large proportions. A favorite form of bequest was the messuage, which was sometimes situated in the country, but usually in the village or town. To catalogue only partially the holdings of St. Peter's, Winchester, six pages of the Rolls are required, and these properties were almost exclusively within the town of Winchester.[21] Beside these rentals there were also Assizes of Bread and Ale, which for Oxford were worth 100s.[22] The *firma burgi* seems to have been quite frequently farmed by the religious houses. In prosperous times it yielded substantial though unpopular profits. In a period of depression it was a source of embarrassment. Channel-passage fees must also be included among the sources of income for houses along the south and southeast coast. The convent of Dover relied upon these fees "as a chief part of their sustenance."[23] Finally, pontage,[24] pavage,[25] mines,[26] road tolls,[27] and breweries[28] should be added to the list of revenue sources.

In each of these sources it is not difficult to recognize a point of contact between the religious house and prevailing economic conditions. The sheep flock, cattlehead, tithe, manor, manor rent, mill, tanning factory, fishery, fair market, tenement rental, Assize of Bread, pontage, pavage, mines and road tolls—each and all were bound to be affected by hard times. Upon the surface it might seem that at least the "jurisdictional" incomes would be immune—that court fees, jail delivery, etc., would not be affected, or if so, increased rather than diminished. But closer inspection reveals that even here there was no exception. These incomes fell away just as did the others.[29]

If the monasteries had been dependent for their revenues upon one or at most only a few of the sources indicated above, some at least might

[18] Cl., R., Feb. 20, 1352, p. 417.
[19] Pat. R. July 18, 1343, p. 99.
[20] Pat. R. April 12, 1353, p. 456.
[21] Pat. R. Nov. 26, 1352, p. 368f.
[22] Pat. R. 12 Edw. III; III:1.
[23] Pat. R. May 11, 1347, p. 347.
[24] Pat. R. March 12, 1332, p. 259.
[25] Pat. R. March 8, 1332, p. 256.
[26] Neuminster Cart. I: p. 211.
[27] Pat. R. May 6, 1337, p. 449.
[28] Pat. R. March 8, 1337, p. 441.
[29] Pat. R. Aug. 19, 1350, p. 563.

have escaped in a period of general depression. Although on the one hand some undoubtedly would have been completely crushed, others would have had a corresponding chance of immunity. But so diversified were their resources that it was inevitable that practically every monastery would be hit by prevailing economic distress.

Another factor yet remains to be noticed, viz: the local distribution of these resources. Usually the holdings of the monasteries were scattered over many shires. Through features peculiar to feudal tenure, and by the natural operations of the law of inheritance, it had come to pass that the vested interests of a monastery might be strewn here, there, and everywhere throughout the realm. From the royal mandate to escheators to surrender the temporalities of religious institutions to their newly elected heads, it is possible to glean the following instances as illustrative of this wide distribution of temporalities.[30]

Westminster Abbey—Temporalities in London, Surrey-Sussex-Middlesex, Gloucester, Worcester, Oxford-Berks, Essex-Hertford, Bucks, Lincoln, Northampton-Rutland.[31]

Wilton Abbey—Temporalities in Wilts, Somerset-Dorset, Devon-Cornwall, Kent, Cambridge-Huntingdon, Southampton.[32]

Ramsey Abbey—Temporalities in London, Huntingdon-Cambridge, Beds-Bucks, Essex-Herts, Norfork-Suffolk, Northampton-Rutland.[33]

Godestowe Nunnery—Temporalities in Oxford-Berks, Northampton, Bucks, Wilts, Southampton.[34]

Suthwyk Abbey—Temporalities in Southampton, Wilts, Sussex, Oxford.[35]

St. Bartholomew Priory—Temporalities in Middlesex, Essex-Herts, Beds-Bucks.[36]

Lilleshull Priory—Temporalities in Salop-Stafford, Warwick-Leicester, Northampton, Notts-Derbys, Yorks.[37]

[30] Inasmuch as the escheators sometimes had jurisdiction over more than a single shire it cannot always be stated with absolute certainity that in respect to the hyphenated cases, there were properties in all the shires mentioned, or in only one or two lying within the escheator's jurisdiction. However, a critical comparison of these mandates makes it reasonably certain that the shires are mentioned only when there was some possession within their bounds.

[31] Pat. R. Dec. 12, 1362, p. 277.

[32] Pat. R. Nov. 24, 1344, p. 367.

[33] Pat. R. Jan. 22, 1343, p. 579.

[34] Pat. R. July 10, 1349, p. 345.

[35] Pat. R. Jan. 4, 1350, p. 433.

[36] Pat. R. June 23, 1350, p. 538.

[37] Pat. R. Aug. 10, 1350, p. 560.

Battle Abbey—Temporalities in Sussex, Surrey, Oxford-Bucks, Kent, Essex, Wilts.[38]

Merton Priory—Temporalities in Southampton, Wilts-Oxford-Bucks, Beds-Berks-Cambridge-Huntingdon, Norfolk-Suffolk-Essex-Hereford, Somerset-Dorset, Devon, Cornwall, Kent-Surrey-Sussex-Middlesex, Rutland-Northampton, London.[39]

Peterboro Abbey—Temporalities in Northampton-Rutland, Notts, Lincoln, Leicester, Huntingdon-Beds.[40]

Cirencester Abbey—Temporalities in Gloucester, Oxford-Berks-Wilts, Somerset-Dorset, Northampton.[41]

Radyings Abbey—Temporalities in Oxford-Berks-Wilts, Hereford, Kent-Sussex-Middlesex, Beds, Herts, Warwick.[42]

St. Peter's Gloucester Abbey—Temporalities in Gloucester, Salop, Hereford, Berks, Warwick, Southampton, Wilts.[43]

St. Mary's York—Temporalities in Yorks, Cumberland-Westmoreland, Lincoln, Cambridge, Norfolk-Suffolk, Holderness.[44]

The *Feodary of Glastenbury Abbey*[45] shows that this house had holdings as under—

	Manor	Hides in Demesne	Hides in Service	Total
Berks.....	1	3—2½ virg.	13	16—2½
Wilts.....	11	190	53—1 v.	243—1
Dorset.....	5	17—1 "	41—3	59
Somerset	24	136—3¾ "	277—¼ v.	314
Devon.....	1			6
				637—2½

[38] Cl. R. Jan. 28, 1351, p. 283.

[39] Cl. R. Aug. 20, 1361, p. 196.

[40] Cl. R. Aug. 20, 1361, p. 196.

[41] Cl. R. Nov. 29, 1358, p. 481.

[42] Pat. R. Sept. 7, 1361, p. 58.

[43] Cl. R. Oct. 29, 1351, p. 327.

"Because the lands of the abbey lie in diverse counties far distant from it and on that account he is frequently impleaded by some scheming to weary him with labor and expense . . . grant for life to Thomas, Abbott of St. Peter's Gloucester . . . general attorneys to sue and defend for him in all such pleas." (Pat. R. Sept. 3, 1352, p. 320.)

[44] Pat. R. June 1, 1359, p. 204.

"Grant to William, Abbot of St. Mary's York, the lands of whose abbey are in counties far away from the abbey that for his life he may make in the king's court general attorneys to sue and defend for him . . ." (Pat. R. June 18, 1359, p. 229.)

[45] Intro. pp. xvii to xlii.

The distribution of temporalities as indicated above unquestionably exposed the institutions concerned to embarrassment during a period of depression. A monastery holding all its property in a single community might have escaped from prevailing distress by some freak of local fortune, but it could hardly hope to be so favored when its holdings were widely scattered throughout the land. If it missed the shock in one locality it was certain to feel it in another. It may be contended, of course, that there was advantage as well as disability in this distribution—that although some holdings were affected, there would always be others immune. This contention would have force if applied to a disaster that affected one section of the country and not the whole. But in a general calamity there was more to lose than to gain by geographical distribution. And all the evidence goes to show that the Black Death was not a disaster that smote one district to the exclusion of others. It was a catastrophe that fell upon the whole land, not excepting the most remote hamlet.

Through the identification of the monasteries with the structure of fourteenth century society, it will be apparent that they were exposed not only to economic depression but also to the infection of the prevailing plague. A pestilence that swept away so many of the Seculars on account of their contact with the populace would have a like effect among the Regulars who also, as incumbents of impropriated churches and manor chapels were in touch with the people. In the southeastern shires where on account of the density of population the plague swept away such enormous numbers, it was inevitable that the monasteries would pay an extremely heavy toll of mortality. When at the approach of the "visitation," people rushed panic striken to the cities,[46] it was to doom to almost certain exposure the hundreds of monasteries grouped in these centers. In the hour of sickness when multitudes turned to the hospitals, it was to convert these institutions of shelter and relief into veritable pest houses. Even the houses which existed apart and solitary in wooded ravines and on the coast were in the zone of danger, for the sea was open to fishing craft, and the highways, however distant were never far away. In this exposure lay the possibility of appalling mortality to practically all the monasteries. How serious this mortality really was, will form the subject of the following chapter.

[46] Pat. R. Dec. 29, 1349, p. 459.

CHAPTER II

The Decimation of the Clergy

It does not lie within the scope of this investigation to discuss in detail the oft-canvassed question of the aggregate mortality due to the pestilence. Was it only twenty percent of the population, or did it rise to thirty, forty, fifty, or even sixty percent? Naturally, the scientific spirit of the modern age has shown a disposition to doubt the accuracy of the heavy mortality figures that until recently have passed unchallenged. And yet it is to be observed that research justifies no substantial reduction in the traditionally accepted figures. Fifty years ago Mr. Seebohm after analyzing the data for Yorkshire and the Eastern Counties came to the conclusion that sixty percent was not an exaggerated estimate.[1] The more recent intensive work done by specialists each confining his investigation within the limits of one or at most a few adjoining shires, embodied in the *Victoria History of the Counties of England*, does not alter the traditionally accepted opinion.

In respect to the clergy, there is not the slightest ground to doubt that the mortality was exceedingly heavy. Although our primary interest is to learn how it fared with the clergy within the monasteries, yet in view of the fact that in the emergency caused by the pestilence, Regulars were drafted into incumbences of deceased Seculars it becomes necessary to study the death rate in the ranks of the clergy outside the cloisters.

From the Episcopal Registers which are largely extant, it is possible to gather reliable data setting forth the institutions to vacant livings. Unfortunately the register-entry does not record the cause of the vacancy, whether due to death, resignation, or deposition. Given the known presence of an epidemic throughout the country, however, a largely increased number of institutions may be reasonably attributed to the ravages of disease.

Beginning at the extreme southwest of the country, Devon-Cornwall shows institutions totaling 345, for January to September 1349, an average of 38 per month as compared with 10 and 6 for November and December, 1348, before the plague obtained.[2] Worcester had 9 for November 1348. For the months December to May 1349, the average

[1] See *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. II, :149 f.

[2] Gasquet, *Black Death*, p. 100 f.n.

rises to 36. Between July and December, 149 presentations were made to 67 of the 138 existing benefices, and in some cases, as for instance, Great Malvern, more than once.[3] Dorset with 218 benefices shows 5 institutions for October 1348; 14 per month from November to March 1349, with a return to normal for April.[4] Somerset with an average per month of 3 institutions, in 1349 has no fewer than 232. In the years 1348 and 1349 there were probably 227 vacancies through death.[5] Wilts, with institutions averaging 26 per year, has 73 for 1348, and 103 for 1349.[6] Surrey from an average of 9 institutions per year, mounts to 92 in 1349.[7]

Hants and the Isle of Wight, with an average of 20 institutions per year, for 1349 leap to the enormous total of 228—11 times the normal.[8] Berks with 128 benefices, and an average of 47 institutions for the period 1345-47, has in 1348, 190 institutions; in 1349, it has 145; in 1350, 93; and in 1351, 66. There was, therefore, more than one institution per benefice during the crisis.[9] Oxfordshire, averaging 7 institutions per year, has no fewer than 103 in 1349.[10] Warwickshire with 4 institutions for April 1349, has 16 per month from May to August, with a decline to 7 in September.[11] Northamptonshire, with 281 benefices, has 148 institutions for 1349. The archdeanery of Northamptonshire alone shows 32 for 1348, 183 for 1349, and 46 for 1350.[12] Derbyshire with 108 benefices, averaging 7 institutions has the following: 1346, 4; 1347, 7; 1348,8; 1349, 63; 1350, 41. Two-thirds of its beneficed clergy were carried away in a year. In each of 8 benefices there were 2 changes in a year; in one there were 3.[13] Hereford and a portion of Shropshire (forming Hereford diocese) with an average of 13 for 1346 to 1348, has 175 institutions for 1349. Vacancies in 1350 probably point to 200 deaths in all among the beneficed clergy.[14] Chester with 70 benefices in all, has 30 institutions for the archdeanery of Chester alone in the months June to September of 1349.[15] Nottingham with 126 benefices

[3] Worc. Historical Society, *Sede Vace*, p. 225-49.
[4] Gasquet, pp. 90 and 192.
[5] Gasquet, p. 192.
[6] Gasquet, p. 189.
[7] Gasquet, p. 209.
[8] V. C. H. Hants II, p. 33. Gasquet p. 130.
[9] V. C. H. Berks II, 13.
[10] V. C. H. Oxfordshire II, 18.
[11] Gasquet, p. 145.
[12] V. C. H. Northamptonshire II, 26.
[13] V. C. H. Derby, II, 167.
[14] Gasquet, 165 f.n.
[15] Gasquet, p. 168.

had 65 vacated in 1349.[16] In the West Riding of York in 141 parishes, 96 incumbents died, while in the East Riding in 95 parishes only 35 survived.[17] In the Archdeanery of Lincoln, averaging 30 to 40 per year, the last half of 1349 gives the number of 302 institutions.[18] Bucks shows 77 institutions for the summer of 1349.[19] Norfolk, with 799 livings, had 527 vacated in 1349 by death,[20] while Suffolk, averaging 81 per year between 1344 and 1348, had in the interval March '49 to March '49, no fewer than 831 institutions.[21] Dr. Jessopp has therefore estimated the clerical deaths in East Anglia at the astounding number of 2000.[22]

Some counties are omitted in this survey, not because their institutions bear no testimony to the presence of the pestilence, but rather because the data are not sufficiently clear to justify any tabulation. It seems that Staffordshire alone escaped the plague, although possibly it was affected in the later stages of the visitation.[23]

From the Patent Rolls which record the royal institutions, a further glimpse into the inwardness of this disaster as it affected the clergy may be obtained. These institutions, it should be carefully noted, represent only a small number of the grand aggregate for the realm. They arise through voidances in the alien priories, in the advowsons of minors, in the advowsons of the king, and in the dioceses of vacant bishoprics and archbishoprics. The following schedule gives these royal institutions for three years, embracing the period from one year before the outbreak of the pestilence to one year after its greatest virulence. Welsh institutions for St. David's, St. Asaph, and Landaff are included.

		Institutions	Exchanges	Resignations
Sept.	1347	5 including	1	0
Oct.	"	9	4	0
Nov.	"	9	3	1
Dec.	"	7	1	0
Jan.	1348	9	2	2

[16] V. C. H. Nottingham II, 57.

[17] *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. II, :151

[18] V. C. H. Lincoln II, 38.

[19] V. C. H. Bucks II, 291.

[20] *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. II, :141.

[21] V. C. H. Suffolk II, 241.

[22] Jessopp: *Coming of the Friars*, p. 220.

[23] The following letter is extant:—"The Pestilence with which God is visiting the sins of the people has not yet come into this diocese, but many other parts of the country are rendered empty by it. Prayer is therefore to be made in all churches for the staying of the plague." (V. C. H. Stafford 1: 282.)

			Institutions	Exchanges
Feb.	"	10 including	6	1
March	"	17	3	1
April	"	12	4	0
May	"	5	3	0
June	"	5	2	0
July	"	8	8	0
Aug	"	8	1	0
(The plague enters England about this date)				
Sept.	"	9	3	0
Oct.	"	18	3	0
Nov.	"	28	3	0
Dec.	"	12	5	0
Jan.	1349	20	1	0
Feb.	"	23	0	0
March	"	44	1	0
April	"	39	0	0
May	"	68	0	0
June	"	144	0	1
July	"	150	1	1
Aug.	"	107	0	0
Sept.	"	71	0	0
Oct.	"	53	1	0
Nov.	"	44	1	1
Dec.	"	24	2	3
Jan.	1350	27	1	0
Feb.	"	35	5	0
March	"	14	4	1
April	"	16	3	0
May	"	11	2	0
June	"	18	3	0
July	"	16	4	3
Aug.	"	11	1	0

During the months May to September, 1349,.....
- at least 79 benefices changed twice
- " " 10 " " three times
- " " 4 " " four times
- " " 2 " " five times

During the year September, 1347, to September, 1348, there were 104 institutions.
For the year Sept., 1348, to Sept., 1349, there were 662 institutions.
For the year Sept., 1349, to Sept., 1350, there were 340 institutions.
Deducting the exchanges which, obviously, did not imply deaths, the institutions for the three years, as above, were 66, 645, and 313 respectively.

It is significant that while the year 1347-48 has 38 exchanges, the following year has only 17, with a decline to 5 between January and November, when the plague was at its worst. Evidently this was no time for shifting ambitious candidates from one field to another. The

problem was to make any provision whatever for such an unusual number of vacancies. The reader may conceive for himself a situation that in a period from May to November is represented by the numbers 68, 144, 150, 107, 71, 53, 44, as compared with the normal figures of 5, 5, 8, 8, 9, 18 and 28. This means that over against the normal number of 58, there is the extraordinary increase to 633, or eleven times the normal! Bearing in mind that these royal institutions at the most represent only a small proportion of the sum total for the country, one may get some idea of the paralyzing blow that fell upon the clergy as a whole.

In considering the fortunes of the religious houses, it must not be forgotten that the records of most of these houses have been destroyed. Only the rarest good fortune has perserved a few vivid pictures which may be taken as typical of all.

Here, for example is the tragic experience of St. Alban's. "The abbot, smitten on Thursday, although feeling the ailment, performed alone and without assistance the services of the day. On the morrow the sickness increasing he betook himself to bed . . . and received the sacrament of Extreme Unction. In sorrow and sadness he continued until noon of Easter Day. And since the plague was then raging and the air was corrupt and the monks were dying day by day, . . . he was hurriedly buried. And there died at that time 47 monks beside those who were carried away in great numbers in the cells."[24]

Others fared as badly. At Meaux the abbot Hugh "besides himself had in the convent 42 monks and 7 lay brethren, and the said abbot Hugh after having ruled the monastery . . . died in the great plague which was in the year 1349, and 32 monks and lay brethren also died. This pestilence so prevailed in our said monastery, as in other places, that in the month of August the abbot himself, 22 monks, and 6 lay brethren died: of these the abbot and 5 monks were lying unburied in one day, and the others died, so that when the plague ceased, out of the said 50 monks and lay brethren only 10 monks with no lay brethren were left."[25]

"Brother James de Groundewell, canon of the monastery of Ivy church . . . wherein a college of 13 canons regular has hitherto been held, coming to the king, has brought news of the death of the prior of that place, and all the other canons thereof, except himself, so that there cannot be any election of prior as usual."[26] "Since all and every one

[24] Gesta Abbatum, Rolls series II, 369.

[25] Chronicon Monasterii de Melsa, Rolls Series III:37.

[26] Pat. R. Feb. 26, 1349, p. 260.

of the brethren of the Hospital of the Blessed Mary Magdalene of Sandown in our diocese . . . are dead in the mortality of men raging in the kingdom of England, none of the brethren being left, the said Hospital is destitute both of head and members."[27]

In the priory of Llanthony 4 canons of 30 survived the pestilence.[28] In the abbey of Hickling all of the canons save one died.[29] Every one of the Dominican friars of Norwich died, so that their house was left deserted.[30] Croxton Curial was almost emptied of its inhabitants.[31] The hospital of St. John Leicester, lost almost all of its inmates.[32] In Luffield every monk died.[33] In the abbey of Peterborough the number of monks was reduced from 64 to 32 and it became impossible to maintain the accustomed routine of services.[34] In Henwood priory the prioress died "and of 15 nuns which were lately there only three remained."[35] St. Swithin's, which until 1349 had an average of 60 monks, after the pestilence never had more than 35; the abbey of Hyde was from like cause reduced from 35 to 20. Romsey, which until 1349 had 90 present in its elections, never after this date had more than 25.[36] Reading where: "by reason of the recent epidemic many of the monks have died," was compelled to request papal sanction of the ordination of 30 monks only twenty years old in order to maintain "the service of their monastery and places subject to it."[37] The register of Newenham states "in the time of the mortality or pestilence there died in this house, 20 monks and 3 lay brethren whose names are entered in other books. And Walter, the abbot, and two monks were left alive after the sickness." Another version of this tragedy reads that "out of one hundred and eleven inmates only the abbot and two monks survived."[38] At Heveringland the pestilence emptied the monastery—"the prior and canons

[27] Reg. Edyndon—see Gasquet, p. 214.
[28] V. C. H. Gloucester II, 90.
[29] V. C. H. Norfolk II, 241.
[30] V. C. H. Norfolk II, 241.
[31] V. C. H. Leicester I, 362.
[32] V. C. H. Leicester I, 362.
[33] V. C. H. Bucks Vol. I, 349.
[34] V. C. H. Northampton II, 26.
[35] V. C. H. Warwick II, 65.
[36] V. C. H. Hants II, 34.
[37] Pap. Reg. I:282.
[38] Gasquet, p. 103 f. n.

died to a man."[39] Bradwell seems to have been almost as unfortunate.[40] At the hospital of St. Thomas, Southwerk, Walter Marlowe asked for a dispensation "that notwithstanding his illigitimacy he may be appointed prior of the Hospital, especially as the mortality among the brethren has left no one so fit to rule as the said Walter."[41] Athelnynge lost two abbots in rapid succession, the first having died on his way to secure royal sanction to his election.[42] At Westminster the abbot and 27 monks were buried in a common grave.[43] In the hospital of St. James "the then guardian and all the other brethren and sisters except one" were swept away.[44]

The above are the authentic cases that depict something of the awful experience through which these religious houses must have passed. It may be objected, however, that these instances were exceptional and therefore should not be used for generalization. This objection cannot be lightly dismissed. Some further evidence is needed that will apply to conditions within the religious houses as a whole. Fortunately this need is met by the Register of abbots, priors, and wardens. Having passed through several critical revisions it may be accepted as reliable although its lists are by no means complete. The cause for a vacancy is not always stated, and the date assigned may refer to the voidance or to the ensuing appointment. Sometimes only the name of the official head appears without any reference to the time of his promotion, resignation or demise. For the present purpose, however, these defects are not serious.

The following table presents the vacancies in the headships of religious houses between 1340 and 1364. Slight inaccuracies undoubtedly have crept in, but due allowance having been made in the final computation, these numbers are substantially correct.

In	Voidances	Resignations Included	In	Voidances	Resignations Included
1340	24	0	1352	29	8
1341	20	2	1353	18	5
1342	22	0	1354	18	3

[39] Gasquet, p. 150.
[40] V. C. H. Bucks V, 150.
[41] Pap. Pet. I, 165.
[42] Pat. R. 1348, p. 395.
[43] Monasticon I, p. 274.
[44] Gasquet, p. 97.

In	Voidances	Resignations Included	In	Voidances	Resignations Included
1343	16	2	1355	22	6
1344	28	2	1356	18	7
1345	29	5	1357	16	2
1346	12	2	1358	22	3
1347	18	5	1359	12	4
1348	22	5	1360	17	0
1349	144	2	1361	56	3
1350	22	2	1362	24	0
1351	24	4	1363	10	1

In examining these figures one cannot fail to note the smallness and uniformity of the number of vacancies from year to year. In explanation thereof, it must be remembered that the abbot or prior usually passed to his honorable position after a long period of monastic fellowship in which his fitness for promotion was thoroughly demonstrated. The chapters did not experiment with unknown candidates. Hence there were very few resignations and depositions. The tenure of office was unusually long—forty years is not at all uncommon[45]—and was rarely terminated save by death or substitution.[46]

The table indicates that from an average of 21 vacancies per year during the period 1340-48, there was a sudden rise seven fold above normal in the year when the plague is known to have been raging at its worst. Between 1350 and 1360 there was a return to voidances slightly below that of the previous decade; but again in 1361 when it is known that there was a recurrence in milder degree of the plague, another sudden rise in vacancies to three fold above the normal appears. This abnormal increase of voidances in 1349 and 1361 with no gradual rise or decline immediately prior or subsequent to these dates unquestionably points to the Black Death as the cause.

Deducting the vacancies due to normal causes, there remain 123 vacancies to be accounted for by some unusual cause, viz., the pestilence. To be conservative, taking the highest number of vacancies occuring in a single year during all this lapse of twenty years, 29 for 1345 or 1352, there remain 115 vacancies. The conclusion, therefore, is unavoidable that the pestilence carried away at least 115 heads in the memorable year 1349.

From this appalling fact it is possible to form some further impressions as to the experience through which the monasteries must have

[45] Pat. R. April 11, 1359, p. 192.

[46] Pat. R. Oct. 12, 1337, p. 539; 1340, p. 503; May 5, 1342, p. 424. V. C. H. Norfolk Vol. II, 401.

passed. Is it not unreasonable to assume that whenever the epidemic entered a religious house the head must have fallen? Obviously there was some chance at least that even when the disease had invaded the monastery the abbot might escape; there was the second possibility that though smitten he might recover. To argue to the contrary would imply that the pestilence swept away every inmate of every monastery which it invaded. This is unthinkable. Hence, the deduction that the epidemic entered more than these 115 institutions. Probably it is nearer the truth to double this number.

And what of the mortality within these ill-fated institutions? Is it conceivable that when the pestilence smote the abbot there was no further mortality? Was an epidemic in twelve score monasteries likely to kill the leader and leave the subordinates? At the most the abbot was only one in a circle rarely as small as 13 and sometimes as large as 100. If in 115 institutions the disease singled out this particular member of the circle how many hundreds and possibly thousands of fellow monks must have fallen!

CHAPTER III

The Monasteries and the Hundred Years' War

In the wake of a pestilence as fatal as that described in the preceding chapter, economic disaster was to be expected. Even if it be assumed that at the moment of the pestilence, the religious houses were on the flood tide of material prosperity, it would still be impossible to regard them as not having been seriously affected by economic depression. But it cannot be insisted too strongly that when the plague entered England, these houses were not enjoying any thing like normal prosperity. For several years they had been passing through troublous times. They had been having difficulty in the collection of their rents; they had been straitened in paying their dues to the king; sometimes they had been compelled to seek remission of these dues or deferred periods of payment. A few were sinking into debt. When, therefore, the plague struck them, it found them seriously impaired and weakened against any abnormal strain. What under normal conditions would have taxed them to the limit of endurance, under these unusual circumstances simply overwhelmed them. Results that seem incredible if attributed only to the plague, become quite intelligible when assigned to this conjuncture of the pestilence with prevailing financial stress.

In order better to understand the bearing of the plague upon economic conditions, it seems necessary to enumerate some of the abnormal burdens that were making it so difficult for the religious houses to struggle along. For several years the nation had been feeling the strain of the Hundred Year's war and the clergy as well as the rest of the nation had been compelled to replenish the royal treasury. The following contributions were made by the clergy:

1. A tenth "lately granted by the clergy"—Nov. 13, 1334.[1]
2. A tenth in process of payment during the year 1335.[2]
3. A tenth in process of payment during 1336.[3]
4. A three-yearly tenth "lately granted," March 12, 1338.[4]
5. A two-year tenth "lately granted," Dec. 3, 1340.[5]

[1] Pat. R. pp. 46 and 53.
[2] Pat. R. p. 112.
[3] Pat. R. 1337, p. 536.
[4] Pat. R. p. 26.
[5] Pat. R. pp. 79 and 155 also 1346, p. 120.

6. A three-yearly tenth beginning in 1343.[6]
7. A three-yearly tenth beginning in 1345.[7]
8. A tenth for at least two years from Sept. 20, 1347.[8]

From the above it is obvious that the religious houses had been steadily contributing one-tenth of their annual income from 1334 to the outbreak of the plague. This means that through the Tenth alone they had given away the full revenue of their possessions for one year and a half. To realize more vividly the real weight of these annual contributions, the remissions granted by the king are worth recording.

St. Michaels, Staumford	10m.
Catteley	37s. 1d.
Sempynham[9]	£ 48 12s. 7d.
Matherseye	£ 4
Lewes	£ 32
Vaudey[9]	£ 23 4s. 9d.
Barlynges	£ 20 8s. 8½d.
Derham	£ 13 2s. 5¾d.
Campesse[9]	£ 3 7s. 4d.
Westminster	£132 13s. 2d.
Chicksand[9]	£ 9 18s. ½d.
Malton	£ 21
Vale Royal	£ 18

Beside the Tenth, there was also the Ninth of Sheaves, Fleeces, and Lambs, voted the king in 1340.[10] The clergy paid the Tenth or the Ninth, but not both, upon the same property. If the assessment was

[6] Pat. R. Feb. 2, 1345, p. 435.

[7] Pat. R. Aug. 21, 1347, p. 375.

[8] Pat. R. pp. 415, 273, 403 and 272.

[9] Amounts vary slightly for different dates.

[10] Statutes of the Realm I, p. 288, 14 Edw. III, Stat. I:cxx. By an exempting clause, it was agreed "that religious men who were not summoned to the Parliament held in Wednesday after Midlent Sunday in his fourteenth year, wherein a ninth of sheaves, fleeces, and lambs were granted to him, and who had paid the tenth previously granted to him on the temporalities annexed to the spiritualities which were taxed with such spiritualities for the tenth in 20 Edw. I, were not to be charged with such ninth." (Pat. R. Nov. 3, 1345, p. 565; Feb. 10, 1346, p. 49.) The exact significance of this exemption is clearly set forth in a royal proclamation issued immediately after. "It is not, however, the intent of the king that by pretext of this grant, the poor cotters, or other, that live of their bodily labor shall be comprehended in the tax of the fifteenth, nor that bishops, abbots, and priors, who shall pay the ninth sheaf, the ninth fleece, and the ninth lamb shall be charged on those contained in their tax for the two yearly tenth last granted to the king by the clergy." (Pat. R. April 20, 1340, p. 499.)

on temporalities as such, the Ninth was paid, but if upon temporalities attached to spiritualities in 20 Edw. I, the Tenth was exacted. Although an over-zealous sheriff sometimes tried to bring a Tenth-paying abbot into the toils of the Ninth, he was confronted by stubborn resistance in which the king, as the strict interpreter of the Law, usually decided adversely to his official.[11] The Ninth represented a tribute from the commonalty corresponding to the Tenth from the clergy.[12] Hence there is no trace whatever of the king's ever having remitted a Ninth to a religious house whereas he often pardoned Tenths. The explanation, of course, is simple. There was no occasion to pardon the Ninth since the monasteries were not paying this tax.

But if the religious houses secured exemption from the Ninth or the corresponding rebate from the Tenth, they were not so fortunate in respect to their holdings of wool. As early as 1337 an Ordinance in Council empowered the king to purchase 30,000 sacks of wool.[13] While abbots and priors usually played an important place in royal administration, their names are entirely missing in the long list of purchasers of wool for the several shires. Apparently as the leading wool growers of the country, they were fleeced by prices so manipulated by the king's agents as to assure a good margin for the royal treasury.

It was not enough, however, for the monks to have their market thus fixed by the king's agents, or to be impelled to grant a subsidy upon each sack of wool.[14] There is much evidence that the king's pay day for this wool was uncertain. All the way through the Rolls there occurs the ominous phrase—"Promise to pay—" for wool. In these acknowledgements of debt the monasteries are quite conspicuous. To illustrate:

Promise to	Prior of Bradenstok for	£67-19-5
"	" Abbot of Glastonbury	£27-2-2
"	" Abbot of Seleby	45M
"	" Prior of Kirkham	£72
"	" Prior of Bridelyngton	90M
"	" Abbot of Derleve	£21-3
"	" Abbot of Meaux	81M
"	" Abbot of St. Mary's, York	£120
"	" Prior of Wartre	45M

[11] Pat. R. Nov. 3, 1345, p. 565 and Feb. 10, 1346, p. 49.
[12] Pat. R. May 12, 1342, p. 428.
[13] Pat. R. July 26, 1337, p. 480.
[14] Statutes of the Realm, 14 Edw. III, Statute I, chap. 21.

Promise to Prior of Bromnore	£28-5-5
" " Prior of Eynsham	51M 3s.
" " Prior of Spalding	51M 9-6
" " Prior of Wroxton[15]	£9-0-18

These acknowledgements were not always for recent receipts of wool. The abbot of Thorneye secured a promise for wool delivered nine years past.[16] The abbot of Pererboro had to wait eight years;[17] the abbot of Quarr, three years.[18] The abbot of Revesby, after getting letters-patent acknowledging a claim for £115 worth of wool, decided to surrender the letter and to accept in lieu thereof, a mortmain license for a church appropriation. The prior of Bromnore followed the same course. For his claim he accepted a mortmain license to acquire land and rent worth 10 marks per year.[19] The abbot and convent of Kirkstede "in consideration of this that by delay in paying for wool taken from them for the king's use and other misfortunes, they are now in a very depressed state" settled their account by accepting an advowson.[20] It is this last case in particular that illumines the situation. Here was a monastery seriously embarrassed, partially at least by the king's tardy settlement for wool, and driven at last to a compromise, necessitated by the king's inability or unwillingness to pay cash. One therefore wonders to what an extent other religious houses not only suffered similar inconveniences for long deferred payment of their appropriated wool, but also in the end were forced to accept a heavy discount. Is it improbable that even a discounted payment was gladly accepted as an alternative to getting nothing at all?

From wool purchased, but paid for subject to the exigencies of a war treasury, an easy transition leads to the next phase of the subject, viz; Loans. Prior to 1338, a few of the larger religious houses made contributions to the "king's service beyond the sea."—St. Edmunds, "a chalice of gold with a paten . . . appraised at £115 and possibly a later grant of £200; Holy Trinity, £20; Peterboro £100; Romesey

[15] See also the abbess of Romseye, the abbot of Sulby, the abbot of Deulecres, the prior of Stone, the abbot of Oseneye, the abbess of Lacock, the prior of Trentham, the prior of Kenilworth, the abbot of Teukesbury (on all see Pat. R. 1339, p. 288-298; 1340, p. 126, 130, 323, 356; 1343, p. 15, 240.)

[16] Pat. R. July 8, 1347, p. 352.

[17] Pat. R. July 16, 1346, p. 150.

[18] Pat. R. July 8, 1343, p. 104.

[19] Pat. R. July 22, 1353, p. 479 also Jan. 23, 1348, p. 451.

[20] Pat. R. Feb. 1340, p. 428.

£100; Abyndon 100M; Glastonbury £100; Redynges £100.[21] For these the king made provision for early repayment through corresponding drawbacks on the Tenths.[22]

But the religious houses as a whole were not to escape through the generosity of a few of the wealthier ones. It is certain that the king secured the voluntary or forced financial coöperation of a large number of the religious houses. In the Patent Rolls for June-Dec. 1347, there is an entry of the king's promise to repay at specified dates prior to Christmas, 1348 the monies lent "at the receipt of the exchequer toward the expedition of the war of France."[23] In this list there are no fewer than 135 contributing institutions. Peterboro, Glastonbury, Hyde, and St. Edmunds, which as noted above, had previously aided the king, are again among the donors. Indeed, Glastonbury leads with a £60 loan. There are two for £50 each, five for £40, seven for £20, eleven for £10, eleven for 10 marks; fourteen for 100s. The others are entered for amounts ranging from £36 down to 30s. The assessment does not seem to have represented any uniformly applied principle of distribution. From a few specific cases such as Westminster, Derham, and Holy Trinity, Ipswich, it would seem that the amount was considerably less than a tenth. Here and there the reader's eye falls upon names that he will soon recognize in the list of monasteries that staggered under depression—Coggeshale, Gerondon, Stanleye, Battle, Lavendon, Bardesle, Thurgarton. He will note, however, that the alien priories are exempted.

It is to be hoped that the king's "promise to pay" was faithfully honored and that money soon to be sorely needed by the monasteries, was turned back into their treasuries just in the nick of time. Yet here there is some ground for doubt. The prior of Ely certainly did not get his £50, since there appears a treasury order of April 1st, 1349 based on the fact that "the prior lent the king that sum in aid of his expenses for the war of France, and the king promised the same at All Saints 1348.[24] In June, 1353, the king still owed the abbot of Peterboro more than £200.[25] In August-November, 1359, bonds were issued to

[21] Pat. R. 1340, p. 450, also July 27, 1338, p. 122; also May 24, 1340, p. 526.

[22] An interesting side light is thus thrown upon the real proportions of the Tenth when it is indicated that the monasteries mentioned above, could be repaid such amounts as the above by a rebate on the two-year Tenth.

[23] Pat. R. June 6, 1347, p. 337f.

[24] Pat. R. April 1, 1349, p. 15.

[25] Cl. R. June 20, 1353, p. 550.

the abbots of Rameseye, Abyndon, Glastonbury, Durham, and Gloucester for large amounts "lent at the receipt of exchequer."[26] If the king was able thus to disregard his obligations to these greater abbots it may be questioned if the weaker ones fared any better or even as well.

Thus far attention has been directed to the religious houses as a whole. But it is necessary to note the special disabilities under which the alien priories found themselves because of the conflict between the kings of England and France. As those who paid "tax or tribute without the realm taking sterlings, silver in plate and vessels of gold and silver without the realm, and bringing in false money or counterfeit sterlings";[27] as "aliens who have many times sent victuals, armor, money, jewels, archers, and other men from England to France and other parts to the king's enemies while at war with him";[28] as houses receiving aliens "who move about in every direction secretly spying out with all their might the secrets and counsels of the king and revealing the same to his enemies"[29]—these houses were viewed with suspicion by the nation generally. It therefore was easy "for the king by pretext of an ordinance made by him and the council under the impulse of necessity" to decree that he "should be answered of the fruits and issues of the benefits of aliens for the defense of the realm and the Church of England during the war with France or until further orders."[30] In July, 1337, these alien houses with their possessions were taken over into the king's hand. Excepting a brief period in the interim of 1337-1341 during which time some were restored to their foreign headship, the situation so remained until February 10, 1361, when the king formally relinquished his control. Irrespective of the possessions of several alien abbots and abbesses dwelling abroad, this administration affected 104 institutions.[31]

The first source of royal income derived from these houses, was the farm annually paid by the custodian as a condition of his tenure of office. How considerable was the king's revenue therefrom may be best

[26] Pat. R. 1359, p. 257-266, 306.

[27] Pat. R. June 12, 1336, p. 296.

[28] Pat. R. July 26, 1348, p. 170.

[29] Pat. R. March 15, 1345, p. 498.

[30] Pat. R. March 8, 1348, p. 89.

[31] Pat. R. Oct. 26, 1344, p. 348 and Feb. 16, 1361, p. 558.

appreciated by the following schedule of farms paid by the respective keepers.

Derhurst	£110	P. R.	1349	p. 272
Newent	£130		1349	272
Arundel	£ 27		1349	113
Ware	£140		1350	133
Wenlok	200M.		1352	220
Hermondesworth	£ 80		1338	56
Haylyng	£ 80		1338	65
Okebourne	£230		1338	154
Montacute	£120		1338	182
Cogges	£ 10		1337	522
Minstre Lovell	£ 40		1344	258
Ravensdale	16M.		1344	197
Wotton	£ 20 (at least)		1355	271
Swaveseye	£ 50 (at least)		1343	108
Lappeleye	£ 20	C. R.	1354	26
Frompton	£100	P. R.	1347	408
Stoke	£120 (at least)		1350	574
Eye	£ 80		1350	574
Fécamp	500M.		1349	272
Wenghale	100s.		1345	539
Pritewell	£ 40		1345	464
Lynton	40M.		1345	456
St. Neots	£160		1349	410
St. Helens	40s.		1355	318
Appeldercombe	80M.		1355	318
Caresbrook	£100		1355	318
St. Faith, Horsham	100M.		1351	83
Kirkeby, Monarchorum	68-6-8		1351	83
Hynkele	£ 32		1351	106
Blyth	23-6-8		1351	177
Holy Trinity, York	100M.		1351	177
Andevere	40M.		1351	132
Thetford	21-10		1351	141
Sautre	£ 40		1351	191
Thrulegh	£ 72		1357	512
Folkeston	£ 35		1357	512
Horton	40M.		1349	416
Styvynton	£ 70		1349	416

Avebury	£ 50	1356	361
Bekford	£ 40 (at least)	1337	466
Tuttebury	£ 60	1350	579
Welford	40M.	1350	579
Otrinton	110	1350	257
Stratford Say	100s.	1353	490
Sporle	£ 10	1353	480
Takkele	£126	1360	364
Bermundesey	£ 50	1359	204
Ecclesfield	£ 20	1358	131
Myntyng	£ 20	1358	133
St. Mary, Lancastre	£ 50 (at least)	1354	111
Uphavene	30M.	1342	389
Linton	100s.	1359	264
Neuton Longevyll	23-6-8	1350	257
St. Andrews, Northampton	200M.	1339	309

It might be expected that in paying such large farms, these priories would have secured exemption from all the other dues laid upon domestic religious institutions. Yet this does not seem to have been the case. Indeed, for a time they not only paid the Tenth, but as aliens they were penalized by a supplementary double Tenth.[32] Exemptions made in favor of priories specially embarrassed indicate that normally the alien priors in addition to their farm, had all the burdens of the denizen religious houses with the probable exception that loans were exacted only from the beneficed aliens.[33]

[32] "The abbot and canon of Vercelli in Lombardy make petition that they be discharged of two Tenths yearly laid upon them among the other alien priories over and above the tenth granted to the king by the clergy of the realm." (Pat. R. Sept. 28, 1348, p. 182 and July 10, 1347, p. 355.) The king consented to this request "in view of unusual circumstances." The prior of Pritewell was "quit of all tenths, fifteenths, wools, and other quota granted by the clergy or commonalty from the time of the taking of the priory into the king's hands because of the war." (Pat. R. Sept. 24, 1347, p. 408.) Because the priory of Swaveseye was "so lean that its goods suffice not for the sustenance of the prior and his household beyond the farm, he has granted that the prior shall be quit of tenths, fifteenths, wools . . . ward of the coast and all other charges so long as the prior have the custody thereof." (Pat. R. July 13, 1343, p. 108.) "In consideration of the mean estate of the priory (Thetford Monarchorum) as well as the immense charges daily falling on the prior, he has granted that from Easter the prior shall be quit of all manner of tenths and talliages . . . so long as the war shall last, provided that he pay yearly fifty marks for his said farm." (Pat. R. July 14, 1341, p. 239.)

[33] Pat. R. 1346, p. 153, 159.

There was yet another hardship inflicted upon some of the alien priors in connection with the custody of their houses. In the selection of the custodian, the usual procedure seems to have been to use the acting head, making him responsible for the collection of the farm.[34] Naturally such a prior-custodian would be disposed to protect the interests of his house and not to use his prerogative as a royal custodian for self-aggrandizement. Sometimes, however, the king took another course by resorting to the pernicious policy of selecting an outsider who had no other interest than to exploit the priory to the limit of its forbearance.[35]

From the case of the priory of Lancaster, administered jointly by the abbot of Whalleye and the king's clerk, some suggestions may be gathered as to how this scheme of royal administration was applied.[36] To each resident monk, the custodians paid 18d. per week for wages and expenses, and 10s. yearly for "his vestments and shoes." To the prior a double allowance was assigned. After paying the king's annual fee, the custodians appropriated the surplus revenues. Not knowing how long they would retain the custodianship, there was obviously no attempt to improve or even maintain the priory estates.

Burdened with such exactions it was only a matter of time until these alien priories should become financially embarrassed. After 1346 the king seems to have confronted an acute condition of affairs in these institutions. He pardoned Prittewell £20 of wools "having regard to

[34] Pat. R. July 13, 1343, p. 108.

[35] To illustrate—William Fraunke made petition that in recompense of £332-9-8 wherein "the king is bound to him by bills under the seals of the king's clerk . . . he might have the custody of the priory (Swaveseye) at the extent until his debt be paid; the king as well for his own advantage as in consideration of the good service of the said William has granted the petition." (Pat. R. Dec. 10, 1340, p. 73.) To pay a £100 debt the priory of Linton was handed over to Guy Ferre, Knight. (Pat. R. March 1, 1345, p. 456.) Creswell was assigned to Burghersh in lieu of a loan which the king evidently was unable to pay at the promised time. (Pat. R. Jan. 14, 1344, p. 154 cf. Feb. 22, 1345, p. 347.) To one of his clerks the custody of Hamel was given. (Pat. R. Sept. 2, 1344, p. 351); to another Stok Cursy. (Cl. R. Dec. 10, 1357, p. 381.) Beaulieu was committed to Thomas de Bourne for the nominal sum of £10. Later "in consideration of the good and gratuitous service of the said Thomas the king pardons him the said farm without rendering anything." (Pat. R. Sept. 28, 1343, p. 124.) Nobody for a moment imagines that any of these custodians accepted what must have been an unpopular task merely to please the king. Some took the office in order to cancel debts. Others received the appointment as hangers-on at Court, in which capacity they took pains to recoup themselves for all the service that they had ever rendered the king.

[36] Cl. R. April 3, 1356, p. 249.

the charges which the house has to bear;"[37] also Lappelye for £18 arrears of its farm.[38] To Lenton "so depressed that all the fruits, rents, and profits will not in these days suffice for the payment of the said farm and the yearly tenth . . . the king has granted license to lease a manor . . . and to sell portions of the tithes of sheaves."[39] The prior and convent of Bermundeseye" . . . on account of the intolerable charges daily incumbent upon them in keeping in repair the breach of Bermundeseye for the defense of their land there, as well as for the great sums which they pay yearly to the king for their farm with other aliens is licensed to lease a manor . . . to relieve their estate and to discharge part of their debt."[40] To the prior of Tuttebury "who in these days is very grievously depressed by poverty," a remission of arrears was granted.[41] The priory of Burwell "very greatly impoverished by the farmers and by the tenths which it with others has paid to the king" was discharged of a 60s. "new subsidy granted by alien priors.[42]

Another group of institutions presented a more intricate problem for the king. Here is the list (inclusive it is to be noted) of some of the strongest of the alien priories—Ware, Newent, Noion-Neufmarche, Derhurst, Ecclesfield, Hamel, Uphavene, Avebury, Blyth, Tuttebury, Halyng, and St. Faith, Horshan.[43] These were all in arrears with their farms and rents and the king in order to protect himself took drastic measures. He solved the difficulty not by remitting arrears but by appointing commissioners to enforce payment. The commissioners, some of whom were the king's Sergeants-at-arms were given powers "compelling payments by the strength and attachment of the bodies of defaulters to be brought to the exchequer." Evidently with these houses it was not so much inability as disinclination to pay. The farmer-priors were finding it impossible to collect from recalcitrant tenants. Hence the royal arm intervened to lend assistance. Just what lies behind the scene is rather difficult to determine. If all these priors had been "outside" custodians, a simple interpretation would be, that the monks, exasperated at the prospect of exploitation by men having

[37] Pat. R. Sept. 24, 1347, p. 308.
[38] Pat. R. Jan. 1, 1347, p. 297.
[39] Pat. R. June 26, 1347, p. 351.
[40] Pat. R. June 12, 1340, p. 543.
[41] Pat. R. June 15, 1341, p. 232.
[42] Pat. R. July 10, 1347, p. 355.
[43] Pat. R. 1347, p. 303, 423, 317, 461, 355, 382: 1344, p. 308, 351, 329, 334: 1342, p. 385, 442: 1348, p. 91, 46: 1346, p. 241.

no interest in their houses had resisted and embarrassed the keeper by prevailing upon the tenants to refuse their rentals. One instance of this probably does occur in the case of Stok-Cursy, farmed by a king's clerk, against whom "the great and powerful men of the country" rose in defiance, refusing their rent.[44] But this explanation will not apply where the custodians were the regular priors. There seems reason to believe that the root of the trouble lay in the appointment of the keeper. Hence in the case of the priory of Montacute where the king first appointed one of the monks to the keepership and then substituted the prior: "It now appears that divers tenants and farmers of the priory had not paid their rents due before the said Oct. 3 to the said John, chiefly on the ground that the custody is now committed to another and the king has appointed him to compel payment of these by distraints or other such means as may be expedient."[45]

This explanation is reasonably satisfactory. It accounts for the arrearages in question, and harmonizes with the king's policy of appointing commissioners to strengthen the hands of the keeper. It also explains the occasional references to waste and misrule in connection with administration.[46]

Up to this point attention has been focused upon the financial assistance rendered to the king by the religious houses. Coast-guard service was another burden which fell upon the houses contiguous to the sea. These houses were expected to guard vulnerable coast points within, or adjacent to, their respective lands. But if there was "imminent danger by the invasion of the enemy elsewhere in the country" the prior and his tenants were supposed "to advance with all their power to offer opposition.[47] It would seem that sometimes the king imposed upon a monastery a part at least of the expense of quartering his army

[44] Cl. R. 1357, p. 382.

[45] Pat. R. 1339, p. 280-1.

[46] But see also further discussion, p. 48, 49.

[47] Upon the petition of the prior of Rochester "showing that the hundred of Haa is impoverished and inhabited chiefly by poor men and the place there called Yenlite, being deep and suited for mooring of ships is a source of peril in these times of war, and that the lands of the prior and his tenants in that hundred are adjacent to the said place, order to charge the prior and his tenants to guard the place called Yenlite and other neighboring places where the enemy might land. Proviso that if there be imminent danger that the prior and his said tenants shall advance with all their power to oppose them without the said hundred." (Cl. R. April 16, 1360, p. 106.)

in the district, or en route to France.[48] In consequence of these services some houses were so reduced that the king felt compelled to grant them special remissions.[49]

The monasteries on the coast were fated to feel the brunt of the plundering and burning which formed so conspicuous a factor in the Hundred Years' War. In Southampton, which was plundered and burnt on account of the negligence of the coast keepers, several houses experienced great reverses.[50] The king had to remit arrears for the prior of Newent who was unable to collect his rents on account of the ravages of the enemy. Portsmouth suffered the same fortune at the hands of the invader. Hence in 1346 the king had to extend "protection for two years for the master and brethren of the hospital of St. Mary Magdalen of Portsmouth, now so impoverished by frequent attacks by alien enemies of the king and priories, of their houses and possessions that they have not whereof to live unless relieved by the faithful elsewhere."[51]

[48] The prior or Christ Church, Canterbury, secured by royal order a shipload of wheat "to take to his priory for maintenance of himself and his men abiding with them upon the safeguard of the shores of Kent, against the attacks of the king's enemies . . . as the king desires to show favor to the prior by reason of the charges he bore at the time the king abode with his army in Kent upon his passage to France and of the expenses he must daily incur in connection with the safeguard aforesaid." (Cl. R. March 16, 1360, p. 141.)

[49] "The king, taking into consideration that the abbey (Torre Devon) being situated on the sea coast has sustained expenses and intolerable charges for the defense of those parts has pardoned all that pertains respecting ninths. . . ." (Pat. R. Nov. 6, 1348, p. 206.)

[50] Pat. R. July 13, 1343, p. 108.

[51] (Pat. R. Jan. 14, 1344, p. 268; Oct. 13, 1338, p. 181; Jan. 6, 1343, p. 575; Nov. 20, 1346, p. 209.) "Grant to the prior and the convent of Suthwyk that whereas their lands and rents in Portsmouth and Southampton . . . have been burned and consumed by the king's enemies of France that they shall not be charged with the payment of Tenths and talliages for three years." (Pat. R. Oct. 22, 1342, p. 579.) The abbess and convent of Tarent "on their petition setting forth that their houses and possessions in the county of Dorset had been burned and destroyed by an invasion of the king's enemies in those parts" were licensed to cut down two hundred acres of under wood in their demesne wood. (Pat. R. Sept. 30, 1343, p. 127.) Protection was granted "for one year for the prior of Dodenasseh whose enemies daily endeavor to seize and draw away his possessions and goods whereby the priory is in many ways depressed." (Pat. R. July 23, 1348, p. 127.) For the abbey of Bynedon "which is now so burdened with debt and depressed in state by frequent visits by the king's alien enemies coming upon them unawares, as well as of other mariners calling there that its ruin is probable unless speedy relief is applied" the king appointed a custodian to apply the revenues . . . in discharge of debts and relief of the estate thereof.

What the enemies of France were to the religious houses of the South, the Scots, allies of France were to the monasteries of the North. Periodically these wild freebooters burst over the border and spread destruction on every side. Traces of their devastation appear all the way through from the third to the eighth decade of the century.[52]

(Pat. R. April 13, 1348, p. 52.) Exactly parallel was the case of Lettele "so depressed by the coming thither as well of alien enemies and other mariners calling there and passing over to foreign parts, and other causes so that it cannot pay its debts." (Pat. R. Dec. 28, 1347, p. 445.)

[52] "In consideration of the great losses caused by frequent forays of the Scots," the abbey of Holt Coltran received a mortmain license for an advowson. (Pat. R. March 29, 1332, p. 266.) The house of St. Robert of Knaresborough was "lately destroyed by the Scots." (Pat. R. April 8, 1332, p. 272.) "For relief of their estate in the destruction of their possessions by the forays of the Scotch" the hospital of St. Mary, Newcastle, secured a mortmain license to acquire land and rent. So also did St. Oswald's Nostell. (Pat. R. Aug. 2, 1333, p. 459, 460.) "In consideration of losses by frequent forays of the Scots," St. Cuthbert's, Durham was pardoned a debt of £300. (Pat. R. Aug. 13, 1333, p. 461.) The hospital of St. Mary Magdalene was also destroyed by the Scots. (Pat. R. Aug. 28, 1333, p. 468.) "Out of compassion for heavy losses sustained by the priory of Brynkebourne" the king remitted a rent. (Pat. R. June 26, 1334, p. 551.) "By diverse fires and other misfortunes lately caused by the Scots in their frequent forays as well as by the destruction of their movables by them, the estate of the abbey of Newminster is so impoverished that the revenues no longer suffice for the support of the monks of the house and the works of piety." (Pat. R. Nov. 11, 1335, p. 176.) Tynemuth "by reason of the Scots as by the coming thither of magnates and others making stay there" was also insufficient for its maintenance and defense. (Pat. R. Feb. 8, 1341, p. 129.) St. Agathas by Richmond "miserably depressed and impoverished by the last coming into England of the king's enemies the Scots "was relieved by a church appropriation." (Pat. R. July 14, 1347, p. 362.) "In Edw. III the king's enemies, the Scots, entered the priory of Ellerton and took and carried away seven charters and writings . . . and the priory was totally despoiled by the Scots." (Pat. R. Jan. 20, 1348, p. 453.) Croxton was burnt and its possessions harried by the Scots. (Pap. Pet. I:128.) Byland "suffering from hostile and horrible invasions" was denuded of its church ornaments and loaded with debt. (Pap. Pet. I:18. See also Hist. Pap. of Northern Registers CCXLV and VI.) After the raid into Cumberland at Michaelmas 1345 "because very many manors, towns, hamlets, lands, and places of the country with the crops, animals, and other goods in them were almost entirely burned and destroyed," the religious men and other ecclesiastics petitioned against a grievous distraint for the last tenths and fifteenths granted by the clergy and commonalty." (Pat. R. March 10, 1346, p. 105.) The fairness of this plea may be judged from the fact that "in consideration of deterioration due to the earlier inroads of the Scots" in Edward II's reign, assessment on church property was reduced in one case from £40 to 40s. and in another from £40 to 36 marks. (Pat. R. 1339, p. 208, 253.)

Although strictly not connected with the Hundred Years' War, this chapter would be incomplete if in closing, reference was not made to another "visitation" which contributed to the economic embarrassment precipitated by the pestilence,—namely, the floods and inundations which throughout the fourth decade of this century caused considerable losses throughout the southern and eastern shires.[53]

In these inundated areas many of the religious houses had enjoyed only a precarious prosperity, so that in flood seasons they experienced real distress. In addition to the loss of harvests and the discomfort of invading waters within their cells, they had the care of extending shelter and hospitality to unfortunates who were forced to flee before the rising flood.[54]

[53] On the confines of Kent and Sussex, Geoffrey Knelle and Isabel Aucher had six hundred and fifty acres of land inundated by water. The towns of Wyngenhale, Walpole, Walsokne, Tylnye, in 1347 complained that floods had swept over the great part of the residue of their lands which had escaped in the eleventh year of the king's reign. (Pat. R. 1347, p. 395; 1348, p. 178.) In Holdernesse "the king's demesne lands, as well as other lands, are entirely inundated . . . by frequent storms that have broken the hithes and walls of the waters of Hull and Humber." (Pat. R. Feb. 12, 1350, p. 518.) The town of Rye "surrounded on all sides by the sea . . . has in great part been consumed by the sea and in other ways and the total destruction of the town is feared." (Pat. R. May 21, 1348, p. 93.)

[54] Hayling "had two hundred and sixty acres of arable land, wood, pasture, and heath swallowed up by the sea . . . whereby the prior has lost entirely a large amount of rent and profit supporting alms." (Pat. R. June 20, 1346, p. 131.) The friars Minor of Boston lost letters, deeds, goods, and chattels "by the sea flooding their houses wherein they were." (Pat. R. May 8, 1354, p. 36.) St. Mary's, Langley, complained "that their income from the marshes has been much reduced by flood both by river and sea, as well as by the number of people asking hospitality. (Pap. Pet. I:291.) The prior of Spalding solicited a church appropriation because "a great part of their possessions is situated between streams of fresh water and the sea, so that they suffer much from inundations . . . so that they are burdened with debt and the duties of hospitality." (Pap. Pet. I:213.) The monastery of Battle "is near the seashore and has suffered much from inundation and wars and is burdened with debt." (Pap. Pet. I:202.) St. Peter's, Shrewsbury "situated on the public road is exposed to inundations and much of it has fallen." (Pap. Pet. I:91.) Tidal floods invaded St. Mary's, Neath. (Pap. Pet. I:62.) St. Bennet, Hulm states "that their lands, possessions and fruits are greatly reduced by floods, fire, oppressions and the duties of hospitality." (Pap. Pet. I:37.) St. Mary's, Selby "burdened by unwonted charges on account of the floods that cover their lands for three miles or more and have destroyed a great part of the enbankment in building which the convent and abbot have spent much and when the work was nearly finished, it was swept away." (Pap. Pet. I:117.) Leiston had its periodical reverses—"its lands and pastures are often inundated and destroyed by tempests at sea, so that their crops and animals fail, and they have not whereof to live and support the alms and work incumbent on their house." (Pat. R. Aug. 19, 1344, p. 349.)

CHAPTER IV

Hard Times

The mortality due to the pestilence within the ranks of the Regular clergy and especially among its leaders has been discussed in preceding pages.[1] It has been shown[2] that considerably over one hundred heads were swept away by the plague. These fatalities represented a loss not only of administrative experience in a critical hour, but also of revenue during the time of the vacancy, inasmuch as all the rents payable during the lapse in headship usually passed into the royal treasury. Sometimes, however, the king in exchange for a fee proportioned to the length of the vacancy, allowed the monastery to retain its temporalities undisturbed. Through the financial terms embodied in these agreements between the sovereign and the religious houses, it becomes possible to estimate the economic loss to the monasteries connected with these vacancies.

In practically every negotiation the king reserved to himself the knight's fees and advowsons of the vacancy period. In addition—

Glastonbury paid 1000 marks per year and pro rata for a longer or shorter term.[3]

Abyndon paid 100 marks per month and pro rata.[4]

Rameseye paid 600 marks for the first three months, or 2000 marks per year.[5]

St. Alban's paid 1000 marks outright, for the full vacancy.[6]

Certeseye paid 500 marks per four months and pro rata.[7]

Wilton paid £60 for the voidance outright.[8]

Middleton paid 40 marks per month and pro rata.[9]

Thorneye paid £40 for four months and pro rata.[10]

[1] See chapter II.

[2] See p. 17, 18.

[3] C. R. Jan. 27, 1332, p. 426.

[4] C. R. Aug. 27, 1332, p. 490.

[5] P. R. Nov. 16, 1342, p. 564.

[6] P. R. Dec. 8, 1355, p. 320.

[7] P. R. Feb. 26, 1342, p. 379.

[8] P. R. June 2, 1340, p. 545.

[9] C. R. May 28, 1331, p. 238.

[10] P. R. May 27, 1348, p. 103.

St. Mary, Leicester paid 4 marks for four months and pro rata.[11]
Bardenay paid £10 per month and pro rata.[12]
Cirencester paid £100 for three months and pro rata.[13]
St. Frideswide paid 10 marks for two months and pro rata.[14]
Romeseye (nunnery) paid 20 marks for the first month and pro rata.[15]
Pershore paid £36 for two months and pro rata.[16]
St. Augustine, Canterbury paid 600 marks for the vacancy outright.[17]
Kenilworth paid £117-2-8 per year or pro rata.[18]
Shafton paid £100 outright.[19]
Tavystok paid £40 for four months or 100 marks per year.[20]
St. Edmund's paid 1200 marks for one year or less.[21]
Peterboro paid 400 marks outright.[22]
St. Peter's, Gloucester paid 100 marks per year pro rata.[23]
Plympton paid £100 and pro rata.[24]

Occasionally a religious house was exempted from any vacancy fee, as for instance Shaftesbury, St. Mary's, Dover, Great Malvern, Raveneston, St. Bartholomew, Lenton, Merton, Llanthony, Battle, Drax, and "all religious houses of the Cistercians." In such cases the king's officer usually came to the priory gate to take seisin in the king's name, or a royal "janitor" might remain in the priory during the period of the voidance.

Assuming that the period of the vacancy was terminated without any unnecessary delay through technicalities raised by the king, it is clear that even a minimum fee such as indicated above was no light incumbrance. And when a religious house had the misfortune to lose several heads in rapid succession, as indeed several had, the financial strain was exceedingly heavy, involving the diversion into extraneous

[11] P. R. Nov. 6, 1363, p. 415.
[12] C. R. Sept. 6, 1353, p. 153.
[13] C. R. Nov. 28, 1358, p. 481.
[14] C. R. April 27, 1349, p. 27.
[15] C. R. April 30, 1349, p. 29.
[16] C. R. July 16, 1349, p. 40.
[17] C. R. Sept. 20, 1349, p. 104.
[18] C. R. July 28, 1361, p. 200.
[19] C. R. July 1, 1362, p. 343.
[20] C. R. Aug. 4, 1362, p. 351.
[21] C. R. March 4, 1361, p. 168.
[22] C. R. June 20, 1353, p. 550.
[23] P. R. Jan. 30, 1327, p. 243.
[24] P. R. Feb. 4, 1366, p. 215.

channels, of practically the entire revenue of the house for months and even years. St. Alban's may be cited as an illustration:—"In consideration of the intolerable charges sustained by the abbot and convent of St. Alban's, by frequent voidance of the abbey the king has granted that of the 1000 marks wherein they are held to him by the last voidance by the death of Michael the last abbot, they shall pay for the present year 100 marks, one moiety at midsummer and the other at Christmas, and 100 marks at each subsequent Easter and Michaelmas until the whole be paid."[25] Five years later this burden of the voidance fee was still oppressing them even to the point of making necessary the leasing of some of their lands.[26] St. Augustine's, Canterbury, also seems to have felt the same burden.[27]

But the suspension of revenue, or the corresponding fee, was not the only drain connected with the voidance. There was the exploitation of escheators, to which monastic properties were subjected during the period of the vacancy. So serious, indeed, had this become that a complaint had been made to the king, and in response to this petition emanating from the prelates and clergy a statute had been passed requiring that "our escheators shall cause to be well kept the voidances without doing waste or destruction in the manors, parks, ponds, or woods; and they shall sell no underwood, nor hunt in the parks or warrens, nor fish in ponds nor free fishings nor shall rack nor take fines of the tenants free nor bond, but shall keep and save as much as pertaineth to the said voidances without (doing harm) or any manner of oppression."[28] Other provisions of this same statute empowered the religious house itself to farm the temporalities, thereby assuring the king the revenue of the vacancy and yet protecting the monastery from unscrupulous spoliation of its properties. This, be it noted, was the explicit reason assigned for some of the contracts entered into between monastery and sovereign.[29]

But it was not enough for the king to receive the voidance revenue nor for the escheator to enrich himself and his friends by misappropriating

[25] Pat. R. Feb. 12, 1350, p. 476.

[26] Pat. R. Dec. 8, 1355, p. 320.

[27] Pat. R. June 23, 1349, p. 330.

[28] Statutes of realm I:294.

[29] It was "in view of the great damage to the abbey of Certeseye in times of voidance by waste of their woods, groves, and other appurtenances by escheators and other keepers thereof, in pursuance of 14 Edward III" that the fee was fixed at 50 marks for each four months. (Pat. R. Feb. 20, 1342, p. 379.) Also "in view of the wastes and losses sustained in their wood and possessions . . . while in the custody of escheators and others during voidance that the abbess of Romsey secured a contract fee of £20 per month during the voidance.

the temporalities. The newly elected abbot, as a token of appreciation of the king's confirmation of his appointment was expected to confer upon one of the royal clerks a pension of 100s. yearly, to continue until such time as the pension could be collated to a benefice.[30] Fortunately in spite of the fact that the Black Death necessitated six score of these pensions, so great was the demand for clergymen that these newly pensioned clerks were soon placed in benefices and hence the religious houses were speedily relieved of the pension burden. This factor therefore may be dismissed as comparatively trifling, although it should be noted that Certeseye felt the payment sufficiently heavy to petition the king for relief and St. Alban's was glad to give an advowson in order to get rid of a pension.[31]

The economic significance of the heavy death toll among the populace next demands attention. That forty per cent at least of the people were swept away with all the suddenness of a flood, makes the Black Death a "turning point" in the economic history of England. It is not to be wondered at, therefore, if students of social and economic history have emphasized the economic import of the pestilence upon the nation as a whole. Into this broader national aspect of the plague, it is not for us to enter, but rather to apply the generally accepted conclusions to the particular subject under consideration.

It is known that thousands of sheep and cattle perished on the ranges; that at the rumor of approaching disease, tenants fled panic stricken from their homes; that tenants died like flies, leaving the manors in silence as a cemetery; that rents immediately failed; that wages soared; that manorial profits shrivelled; that laborers grew insolent and arbitrary; that bondsmen gained their freedom; that mills stopped; that buildings went to ruin; that markets and fairs ceased to exist; that fishermen died in boat loads; that the revenue of stampage declined; that boroughs were unable to collect their farms; that road tolls decreased; that passage dues failed; that even the courts for a time were paralyzed.

Recalling what was emphasized in the introductory chapter respecting the intimate contact between the monastery and the community, is it not clear that each of the consequences enumerated above represents a group of religious houses smitten by depression? If cattle and sheep perished, were not some of these upon the pastures of the monasteries?

[30] Pat. R. July 12, 1347, p. 356.

[31] Cl. R. May 14, 1350, p. 222.

Did the religious houses not have their tenants and their bondmen? Were mills not a factor in their income? Had the monasteries not farmed the markets and the borough fees? Had they not gathered toll and passage dues? Had they not enjoyed the perquisites of court? Was it not inevitable therefore that through one, if not indeed through many of these economic avenues, practically every religious house must have felt the pressure of disaster?

Speculation, however, is unnecessary. The actual situation is reflected in the appeals for assistance directed to the king by the monasteries seeking some concession in partial relief of their distress. In the period 1350-65 there were no fewer than 152 religious institutions that secured some concession of this character. They are distributed as follows:

In 1349	houses	seeking	aid	numbered	3
1350	"	"	"	"	20
1351	"	"	"	"	25
1352	"	"	"	"	22
1353	"	"	"	"	9
1354	"	"	"	"	11
1355	"	"	"	"	17
1356	"	"	"	"	7[32]
1357	"	"	"	"	9
1358	"	"	"	"	4
1359	"	"	"	"	2
1360	"	"	"	"	3
1361	"	"	"	"	7
1362	"	"	"	"	5
1363	"	"	"	"	2
1364	"	"	"	"	5
1365	"	"	"	"	1

The fact that 152 houses clamored for outside assistance during this period is more significant when this number is placed beside the corresponding appeals during the years preceding the pestilence. Between 1331 and 1348 inclusive, there were only 40 appeals for aid. In other

[32] By way of explanation it should be added that the smaller numbers from 1356 onwards do not mean that only these comparatively few houses were having trouble, but rather that these in addition to those of the earlier years of the decade were in distress. All the cases where a house kept coming back again and again for relief have been omitted. Only the date of its first appearance has been considered.

words, in the eight years between 1350 and 1357 when the depression was greatest, there were three times as many cases of distress as in the twenty-seven years preceding the visitation.

The details connected with these appeals for aid reveal the terrible distress through which the religious houses must have passed. Thirty-one institutions reached such a crisis that the sheriff's seizure seemed imminent, and the king in order to prevent distraints was constrained to interpose with his protection. There were at least eleven houses in which the revenues so dwindled that the monks had not sufficient to live unless relieved from without. There were cases where the monks or nuns, despairing of food, dispersed, leaving the house "of itself unable to rise again." Of some it is recorded "that servants and households in the last pestilence died totally and their lands remained for the most part untilled, and their crops perished miserably not gathered in . . . and tenements wherefrom the rents of the priory arose have remained empty by the death of the tenants." It is not infrequent to find creditors suing for claims and arrearages so accumulated upon lands and farm "that no one dares to take any of the land for fear of the said arrears of the farm." Again and again the king's reduction of fee, time extension, or entire remission of his farm were not sufficient for the crisis. The entire administration of the monastery had to be transferred into the hands of royal receivers in the endeavor to enforce payments of long deferred arrears. In scores of instances distress was such that relief was sought from church appropriations, reductions of the annual farm, remission of dues—any possible shift by which the crisis might be tided over. Here and there a house having exhausted all its rentals and harvests and hoarded treasures, sought to meet its liabilities by cutting down its oaks and other trees. But even then all was in vain—"the farm is in arrears, the church and house of the priory threatened to fall in ruins, and he (prior) has already sold the priory wood to pay his farm so that there is nothing now to pay the farm with."[33]

Another evidence of this economic depression within the religious houses is to be found in the "Recognizances." These were acknowledgements of debt made before the court, resembling in many respects court judgments of our own times.

[33] From this brief characterization of the situation, the reader may turn to appendix I for a schedule that much more vividly reflects this economic crisis. See pages 74-88.

A summary of the judgements for the period is as follows:

In 1349	recognizances	against	8	houses[34]					
1350	"	"	15	"	including	2	in	court	before.
1351	"	"	23	"	"	10	"	"	"
1352	"	"	17	"	"	5	"	"	"
1353	"	"	13	"	"	8	"	"	"
1354	"	"	15	"	"	10	"	"	"
1355	"	"	9	"	"	6	"	"	"
1356	"	"	5	"	"	2	"	"	"
1357	"	"	8	"	"	5	"	"	"
1358	"	"	10	"	"	6	"	"	"
1359	"	"	1	"	"	1	"	"	"
1360	"	"	3	"	"	2	"	"	"
1361	"	"	3	"	"	4	"	"	"
1362	"	"	2	"	"	2	"	"	"

In all, no fewer than 76 houses had judgments recorded against them, while 63 of the number had to face this embarrassment more than once. Some indeed were in the courts almost every year. Lesnes had judgments recorded against it in 1350, 1352, 1354, 1355, 1357, 1358 and 1361; Stanleye, in 1351, 1352, 1353, 1355, 1358, 1360 and 1361; St. Bartholomew, London, in 1350, 1352, 1353, 1354, 1355, 1357, 1360, 1361, 1362.

It has been shown that 152 houses went to the king for some form of temporary assistance. Naturally some of these were the ones embarassed by recognizances. To estimate the situation correctly it will not do therefore, to add the number of monasteries that sought the king's assistance to those that were forced into court. It is necessary to eliminate names common to the two lists. Of these there are 28. The conclusion to be drawn, therefore, is that at least 202 institutions were seriously affected by the pestilence.

In the case of alien priories 46 are found in the column of distress—that is, slightly less than fifty per cent.

And what is to be inferred concerning the financial condition of the hundreds of other religious houses the names of which have not been recorded among those petitioning the king for compassion or unable to meet their creditors? Does the silence of history imply that these were having no difficulties? During the fifth decade of this fourteenth century practically none of the hospitals were licensed to collect

[34] For detailed information concerning these Recognizances see the Appendix II, p. 89f.

alms, whereas in the third decade about two score were going up and down the land seeking the doles of the people. Is it to be argued from this that these hospitals no longer needed the aid of the community? Is it not rather that times were so hard that begging was of no avail? Silence in respect to these hospitals keeps the veil over what must have been one of the most tragic chapters in all their history. Furthermore, if only four score monasteries had judgments entered against them, does this imply that none of the others had debts which they were unable to pay? Is it not obvious that the most embarrassed were the very ones not forced into court? Of what use was a judgment if a house was bankrupt? Finally if 152 made appeals to the king for aid, does this imply that the hundreds of others needed no such appeal? Manifestly it was not so with the four score that were brought before the courts. The fact is, that no matter how embarrassed a monastery found itself, it could not rush forthwith to the king. It had to have some ground upon which it could reasonably appeal to royal compassion. This the alien priories had in the farm which they annually paid to the king. It is probable that while such a large percentage of these priories appear in the impoverished class, an equally large proportion of the domestic houses was similiarly affected though their names do not appear, inasmuch as they had no special cause to plead as a basis for royal clemency. They may have had just as grave financial difficulties, but they were forced to struggle on in silence for lack of any basis upon which to negotiate with their sovereign.

CHAPTER V

The Financial Crisis

In the light of what has preceded, it is evident that in the crisis precipitated by the pestilence, the religious houses found themselves confronted with two overshadowing problems—first, that of filling the clerical ranks depleted by death, and secondly that of financing their way through a period of depression. It is now necessary to examine the steps by which attempts were made to surmount these two problems. Undoubtedly it was the pressure of the former that first weighed upon the monasteries. While the details of the preceding chapter are fresh within the reader's mind, it seems advantageous to set aside this chronological consideration and to pass immediately to the financial crisis, reserving for the concluding chapter the problem of finding recruits to fill the gaps of the deceased.

There are several reasons why one might expect the king to have formulated a strong financial policy calculated to relieve the monasteries in their hour of embarrassment. They had already made handsome contributions to his war chest, relieving him more than once from humiliating retrenchment in his military campaigns. There can be little question that in some instances, at least, the religious institutions had been reduced to sore straits not so much because of the plague as for the reason that they had backed the king beyond the real limits of their resources. In gratitude therefore, it was surely incumbent upon Edward III to have devised some scheme for substantial and general relief of the monasteries. Expediency, if no other consideration, so directed. The king could ill afford to see institutions, whose interests economically as well as morally were so interwoven with those of the nation, submerged beyond recovery in the floods of bankruptcy. Their resources had been a bulwark to the nation in the brilliant Cressy campaign and a renewal of the war was certain as soon as both nations had partially recovered. The financial aid of the monasteries, therefore, was likely again to be needed, which in the nature of the case would be limited by the measure of their recuperation from the effects of the pestilence.

It is to be observed, that Edward had early shown some evidences of appreciation of the value of the monasteries by granting during the years 1331 and 1338 inclusive, mortmain licenses to 144 religious houses. Nor was this all. In Dertford he founded and endowed two houses of the

Friars Preachers; to the Hall of Queen Philippa at Oxford he made substantial gifts; a like interest he showed in the Hall of the King's Scholars, Cambridge, and in the chapels at Windsor and Westminster.

When the great strain came upon the monasteries in 1349, as already indicated[1] clemency was extended by the royal treasury to such as had experienced exceptionally heavy misfortune. In the aggregate the number relieved was not small and the remissions involved deprived the king of a large amount of money. At first it might seem that this sacrifice was impelled by real gratitude "in consideration of the many subsidies made to the king." But a closer examination reveals only a shrewd, calculating self-interest. Genuine gratitude would scarcely have been satisfied in pardoning the arrears to a few desperately embarrassed houses. It would have issued a general remission of the Tenths for a part at least of this trying period. Of this there is no indication whatever. Five biennial Tenths, a triennial, and a yearly completely span the period between 1347 and 1360. Evidently the king had no scruples in burdening the religious houses to the utmost of their resources. In dispensing a royal pardon, it was not so much "in consideration of the many subsidies already granted" as that one more exaction was likely to drive the unfortunate house into complete ruin. And this the king obviously was anxious to avoid.

The king's policy was to promote his private interest in the welfare of embarrassed houses. Grace at least, was cheap. He could issue a mortmain license without draining his treasury. And this he did. In the earlier part of his reign he issued approximately 100 of these licenses. Between 1340 and 1349 there is a marked decrease in licenses—only 64. But between 1349 and 1351 there is a significant rise to double the number of the preceding years. The inference is clear. Distressed houses not already in possession of a license turned to the king to secure one. Although it may be safely assumed that many of these licenses, especially those issued in the earlier part of his reign, are not distress signals, it is to be noted that in several of the later cases the connection between poverty and the license is expressly stated, as, for instance, Romeseye nunnery, Pynham, Marleburgh, Drax, Henton, St. James.[2] At least 139 had not exhausted the licenses given to them before the pestilence. Fully 200, therefore, had the king's authority to secure property from whatever donors they could.

To extend royal protection and to appoint a royal custodian were also inexpensive. Hence there are many instances in which these courtesies

[1] See Appendix, p. 74, 76, 77, 81.

[2] Pat. R. 1351, p. 59, 195: 1350, p. 444, 468; 1348, p. 448; 1354, p. 46.

were extended to embarrassed institutions. The appointment of a custodian was of really great service to a monastery in trouble.

Edward was generous in not always enforcing the confiscation of properties acquired without license. Not that his escheators and sheriffs relaxed their vigilance in unearthing irregularities committed sometimes a generation before. Half an acre of land, a parcel of the glebe of his church, unwittingly fenced by the parson without obtaining a license was quite sufficient to get him into trouble.[3] Hence the oft-recurring voluntary confessions made to the king, of some slight irregularity innocently committed long years past. Better to take the initiative in confession than to have the offense ferreted out by some officious hireling of the Court. But the king was not indiscriminately severe with these irregularities. When confronted with extenuating circumstances he frequently waived his right of confiscation, as, for instance, in the case of St. Mary, Winchester.[4] However, in many cases the king did impose the full penalty.[5]

But by far the greatest service rendered by Edward to the monasteries was his timely intervention to protect them from the unscrupulous misrule, callous religious indifference, and wild lawlessness which, as will appear later on, were so rampant during the years immediately succeeding the pestilence. This intervention took several forms.

In the matter of the misappropriation of bequests to religious houses, an abuse which seems to have prevailed quite generally, the king appointed commissioners "to make inquisition what lands had been conferred (upon the monasteries) and the whole truth as to the trespasses and contempt aforesaid, and to do all other things that they find necessary or expedient." Similarly when trust funds were diverted to the enrichment of designing exploiters, commissioners were delegated to investigate the irregularity. Sometimes a more drastic step was taken when the property was "seized into the king's hand" and an injunction issued against the payment of the legal corrodies and payments. A visitation

[3] Cl. R., Oct. 18, 1359, p. 598; Pat. R., June 20, 1347, p. 347.

[4] One of the many houses that felt the depression acutely had acquired at various times an enormous number of properties without licensed authority. Although this irregular procedure had been overlooked or condoned, at last it attracted the king's attention; but "whereas the prior and brethren have entered into the same without license and many deeds, testaments and muniments touching the said acquisitions and bequests have been taken away and lost in the last pestilence, the king in consideration of their poverty and want, and for £10 which they will pay him, has granted license for the prior and brethren to retain the same acquisitions and bequests." (Pat. R., Nov. 26, 1352, p. 372.)

[5] Pat. R., Oct. 12, 1361, p. 151.

was often ordered when a religious house had allowed its services to lapse and its goods to be dissipated. An alternative course was to take the defaulting house completely into the king's hand. When a monastery was suffering from the attacks of raiders, the king frequently extended his royal protection.

I. Misappropriation of Bequests

Commission . . . whereas some who died in the last pestilence, out of affection for the house (Dertford) and to save their souls, granted lands and goods to certain men for the use of the said house, and whereas a very large number of such lands, because they were alienated contrary to the will and intention of the donors, were seized into the king's hands by the escheator of the king's chamber, and afterwards were taken out of his hands by others and occupied, and so these lands as well as other lands conferred on the house are detailed from the said house . . . to the damage and disherison of him and the house; he has appointed them to survey the house and make inquisition what lands have been conferred upon it, or for its own use before these times, or the names of those who took out of the king's hands the said land . . . and the whole truth as to the trespasses and contempt aforesaid . . . and to do all other things that they find necessary or expedient. . . ." (Pat. R., March 18, 1352, p. 280.)

II. Misappropriation of Trust Funds

Commission . . . reciting that the king is given to understand that the lands, rents, and possessions of St. Julian . . . are occupied by men of those parts and converted to other uses, and so the number of their lepers is greatly diminished for lack of sustenance, prayers, alms, and other works which used to be made . . . he has appointed them to make inquisition touching lands . . . number of lepers . . . how much each used to take yearly for his sustenance and what lands had been taken from the hospital." (Pat. R., Nov. 12, 1355, p. 330.)

Mandate to . . . to cause all lands, rights, services, and rents, which can be proved to have been alienated, withdrawn and concealed to be seized into his hands and kept safely to relieve the priory. . . . Injunction to them also against payment of corrodies and pensions granted while the priory has been in the king's hands. (Pat. R., April 3, 1356, p. 358; April 12, 1357, p. 523.)

Mandate to . . . to make a visitation of the hospital of St. Leonards, Derby, as the king understands that the warden does not attend to the keeping and rule thereof, but has dissipated the goods . . . and so what was of old set apart for pious uses is converted to profane uses." (Pat. R., March 30, 1351, p. 84; Cl. R., March 20, 1359, p. 526.)

III. Lapsed Religious Services

"Although the escheator took the same (St. Margarets, Huntingdon) into the king's hands with its lands, rents, and other possessions, because it was found by inquisition of office that the said warden did not find a certain chaplain to celebrate daily in the hospital or maintain other charges incumbent upon the hospital." (Cl. R., March 20, 1359, p. 556, 563.)

IV. Lawlessness

Commission to . . . reciting that the king is given to understand that the priory of Atherbury . . . has alienated manors . . . carried away relics, vestments . . .

killed Agnes Pickerdale, and atrociously wounded a fellow-monk of his, so that the priory is suspended . . . and the prior has put eight men of powerful build to collect the goods and profits of the priory, who collect and waste the goods . . . appointing them to make inquisition touching these felonies." (Pat. R., Jan. 26, 1357, p. 548.)

Protection for two years for the abbot of Torre, Mohun, on his petition showing that a large confederacy of disturbers of the peace, men at arms and others, purposed to come to the abbey and granges, manors . . . and consume and waste the goods and things therein." (Pat. R., Nov. 6, 1351, p. 186; Nov. 20, 1352, p. 380.)

Commission of Oyer and Terminer to . . . on complaints by the prior of Llanthony that . . . carried away such goods to the value of one thousand pounds." (Pat. R., April 12, 1353, p. 456.)

Appointment of . . . king's sergeants-at-arms to collect from those who at present refuse payment of arrears of farms, rents, tithes, alms, portions, and pensions. . . . compelling payment by distraints and attachment of the bodies of defaulters.' (Pat. R., May 8, 1347, p. 317.)

Turning now to the service rendered by the people to the religious houses in their financial crisis, one might naturally suppose that after the first shock of the pestilence had passed away there were likely to be large numbers who would bequeath their property in whole or in part to the cherished religious institutions of the country. But the supposition is contrary to fact. Setting aside all our preconceptions of what ought to have happened, and examining critically what really did happen, as revealed in the mortmain provisions for the monasteries, no increased benevolence whatever during the period immediately after the pestilence can be found.

Let us first consider the filling of the licenses which the king had issued to the religious houses. If there had been any widespread disposition to relieve the monasteries, undoubtedly there would have been a substantial increase in the number of licenses that were taken up "in full satisfaction." Yet this is what the documents reveal:

Licenses taken up in full between						1335	and	1340—	6
"	"	"	"	"	"	1340	"	1345—	9
"	"	"	"	"	"	1345	"	1350—	14
"	"	"	"	"	"	1350	"	1355—	16
"	"	"	"	"	"	1355	"	1360—	14
"	"	"	"	"	"	1360	"	1365—	16

In the period of 20 years between 1345 and 1365 there was only a slight fluctuation between the numbers 14 and 16. In the years 1345-48 (before the pestilence) there were 13. What little significance might be attached to this slight increase is completely removed when it is considered that some of these licenses had been running for many years, during which time the holding houses must have been partially filling out

their license powers. Eliminating the pestilence altogether, it is to be expected that, as Edward's reign drew towards its close, there would have been some slight increase in the filling out of the licenses so lavishly given near the beginning of his reign.

More convincing, however, is the testimony afforded by the actual number of contributors disposed to bequeath property to the church.

In 1331-35	(four years)	there	were	200 contributors
" 1335-40		"	"	247 "
" 1340-45		"	"	226 "
" 1345-50		"	"	213 "
" 1350-55		"	"	218 "
" 1355-60		"	"	137 "
" 1360-65		"	"	157[6] "

There was, therefore, a steady decline of almost 50 per cent between 1335 and 1360, or of 30 per cent for the years 1350 to 1365.

An examination of the conditions attached to these bequests shows that frequently the donor was particularly interested in the chantry or chantry chaplains attached to the monastery. He often specified that his bequest was to be utilized for chaplains who would pray for his or some other person's soul. He was not interested in the monastery as such, but in the chantry adjoined thereto, or in the chaplains whose special function it was to pray for the deceased.

Deducting the number who made conditional gifts of this kind, the table is as follows:

In 1331-35		there	were	199 contributors
" 1335-40		"	"	198 "
" 1340-45		"	"	190 "
" 1345-50		"	"	184 "
" 1350-55		"	"	177 "
" 1355-60		"	"	116 "
" 1360-65		"	"	119 "

Here again there was practically the same decline—a 60 per cent decrease between 1335 and 1365, with substantially no difference between the two periods, 1355-1360 and 1360-1365.

[6] These figures have been compiled from carefully prepared schedules containing the donors, inheriting institution, and property bequeathed. It has been impossible to present these schedules to the reader, inasmuch as they have been far too bulky to appear within the limits of even the most comprehensive appendix. Great care has been expended in the tabulation of numbers upon which rests a conclusion so important for this investigation.

It may be objected, however, that this decline in the number of contributors really means little in view of the stringent economic condition prevailing between 1350 and 1365; that at the most, it only signifies that fewer people had property which they could afford to bequeath to a religious institution, and that it does not indicate a corresponding change of attitude toward the religious houses. In answer to this objection, let the statistics be presented, giving the number of contributors to parish churches, rather than to monastic institutions.

In	1331-35	there were	125	contributors
"	1335-40	" "	129	"
"	1340-45	" "	116	"
"	1345-50	" "	142	"
"	1350-55	" "	173	"
"	1355-60	" "	91	"
"	1360-65	" "	110	"

It is to be observed that despite the economic distress, the number of contributors to parish churches between 1350-55 rose 36 per cent above the average for the 20 preceding years, and that for the entire period of 1350 to 1365 the average was substantially the same as it was before the pestilence. The only conclusion, therefore, to be drawn is that the religious sympathies of the people remained strong and steadfast, but that the object of their benevolence was changed. The Regular clergy lost ground at the expense of the Secular clergy.

This testimony comes from another source. Through the necessity imposed upon the king to send out commissioners, some sidelights are thrown upon the lawlessness that was manifested against the religious houses. What is in mind here is not incessant trespassing upon religious lands when warrens were hunted, tanks and stews were fished, trees felled and closes broken. This trespassing is such an ever-recurring phenomenon in mediaeval civilization as to call for no particular comment. It is not to be wondered at, especially in the disordered society of 1350-60, if much of this sort of pillaging occurred. But in the period under review there developed a wanton lawlessness that seemed to delight in working havoc and destruction among the monasteries. The abbot of Abbottesbury complained that ". . . took away a horse of his . . . depastured his grass with cattle, and afterwards they came armed with others confederate with them and besieged him, his monks, and his men and servants in the abbey so straitly that they dared not leave it to collect their crops . . . and assaulted other of his men and servants . . . whereby he lost the service of these for a great time . . . they so

threatened him and his monks . . . that they have not dared to return to celebrate the Divine services for the souls of the royal founders of the abbey."[7] The prior of Repyndon complained that ". . . assaulted his men and servants whereby he lost their service for a great time, and plotted to kill the canons and servants of the priory, so usurping the royal majesty and so threatening the canons and servants that for fear of death they dare not go forth from the priory to seek for victuals and to till and sow their lands."[8] The Friars Minors of Newcastle had their goods carried away, their persons assaulted and one abducted.[9] The prior, monks, priests, and servants of Tykford were chased to the priory church, the doors were broken and the refugees beaten "to the shedding of blood."[10] A confederacy attacked Burton-on-Trent, "assaulted the servants . . . would have burned the abbey if they had not been presented by others . . . compelled the servants to swear that they would no longer serve the abbot."[11] Armed evil-doers entered by force the abbey of St. Peter, abducted a fellow monk, carried away goods there, "and now run to and fro threatening to do the abbot and his monks and servants all the evil they can, whereby these dare not go forth from the abbey to survey the manors and lands."[12] Evil-doers breaking the doors of the abbey of Bruerne, imprisoned the abbot, detaining him in Hayles while his goods were carried away.[13]

It is no exaggeration whatever to say that there are scores of cases similar to these just cited, so that the impression left upon the reader is that of a deeply rooted and widespread hostility directed against the religious houses. The Seculars do not appear to have been attacked with anything like the same vehemence. Now and again a mob made things unpleasant for them, but such occurrences were relatively few, and the number shows no perceptible rise during the critical period immediately after the plague.

This raiding does not seem to have been prompted by desire for spoil. Rather it was evil-doers who set out wantonly to destroy property—to trample crops, to depasture grass, to assault and abduct servants, to terrorize the monks, to worry sheep and goats with hounds, to impound

[7] Pat. R., Nov. 10, 1351, p. 203.
[8] Pat. R., April 8, 1354, p. 65.
[9] Pat. R., May 2, 1354, p. 65.
[10] Pat. R., Nov. 28, 1355, p. 332.
[11] Pat. R., Feb. 1, 1355, p. 230.
[12] Pat. R., July 7, 1358, p. 80.
[13] Pat. R. Jan. 8, 1364, p. 454.

and sometimes to steal cattle. Had plunder been the object of these incursions, the victims naturally would have been the treasure-monasteries where the collectors of the Tenths, Fifteenths, and Ninths stored their moneys prior to their delivery at the exchequer. To pillage the treasure-houses was a possibility always to be guarded against. Hence special care was always exercised in selecting houses not only easy of access, but also strongly guarded against possible assault.[14]

The remarkable fact is, that during the depression that followed the plague there is no indication that these treasure-houses were singled out for attack. In Bernewell alone, which was the tax depository for Cambridge, disturbers "break the treasury thereof . . . and carried away treasure from the treasury."[15] Watton also lost twelve cups and forty silver spoons worth £20, "With two hundred in money by tale found in the box."[16] How mysteriously meagre are these treasure losses, if what the plunderers were seeking was money! The mystery vanishes when these raids are regarded as the expression of a violent hatred that gloried in making things just as unpleasant as possible for the monasteries.

What, then, is the explanation of this hostility? Probably it would be an error to seek to trace this animosity to a single cause rather than to several all operating together in a period that admittedly teemed with conflicting interests, passions, and strife.

First of all, there was the attitude taken by the church in respect to the Statute of Laborers. Having proclaimed this famous statute, the king addressed the bishops in a "request to cause the premises (statute) to be proclaimed in all the churches and other places of his diocese, as he sees fit, ordering the rectors, vicars of churches, and his other subordinates to induce their parishioners to work and to keep the said ordinances."[17] This meant, therefore, that the church put herself behind this famous statute. She sided with the interests as opposed to the laboring masses. The higher clergy aligned against the lower clergy and published a proclamation, part of which enjoined the bishop "to moderate the

[14] Langele was unsuitable "because the abbey is not a safe place for keeping so great a sum for that it is situated in a lonely place." (Cl. R. June 20, 1360, p. 59.) Wardon has been reported "as situate in a desert and wooded place whereby it is not a safe depository for the king's money." (Cl. R. Nov. 1, 1356, p. 282.) Later the abbot thereof was ordered "to cause a strong house in his abbey secured with locks to be delivered without delay to the collectors of the Tenth and Fifteenth that the monies thence arising may be stored and safe kept." (Cl. R. April 2, 1360, p. 105.)

[15] Pat. R. Nov. 15, 1356, p. 496.

[16] Pat. R. Nov. 6, 1355, p. 330.

[17] Cl. R. June 18, 1349, p. 88.

stipendiary chaplains of his diocese, who also will not serve without excessive wages, and compel them to serve for the accustomed wage upon pain of suspension and interdict."[18]

Although this mandate was addressed to the bishops, and, so far as explicit evidence shows, not to the heads of the Regular clergy, yet there is nothing to indicate any disinclination on the part of the latter to advocate the strict enforcement of the statute. As a matter of policy, with their enormous landed interests involving so many tenants and laborers, the religious houses had everything to gain by rigidly enforcing the statute. Probably to no class in the nation more than to the monks was the demand for free labor and higher wages embarrassing. Even the statute with its artificial protection was not enough to meet their problem, for in 1361, the king suffering from the competition of "prelates of noblemen of religious and others" who were paying excessive salaries, issued another proclamation prohibiting "wages other than in the ordinance."[19]

It is obvious that the advantages gained by the monasteries through the enforcement of the detested Statute of Laborers made them all the more unpopular with the masses. Just because the religious houses had such large landed interests, in the popular mind they stood for the old régime vs. the new, for restraint vs. freedom, for class interest, taskmasters, serfdom, and low wages. How inevitable, therefore, the rising sense of indignation! How natural the protest that destroyed property, that repudiated commercial monopoly, that challenged monastic administration of the courts![20]

These considerations, it should be observed, explain why some of the popular indignation occasionally turned against the bishops. These also, quite as much as abbots, represented self-interest entrenched behind reactionary legislation. They, therefore, had to bear the brunt of assault and intimidation, in the same fashion though in a much lesser degree than the monasteries.

A second factor in explanation of this hostility against the religious houses may have been their intimate connection with the raising of the king's levies—Tenths, Fifteenths, and Ninths. In the collection of the Tenths and Fifteenths, the writs for 1334 indicate that with the single exception of Westmoreland, the work was done by a layman

[18] Cl. R. June 18, 1349, p. 88; also, Registrum Johannis de Trillek, F. 97.

[19] Cl. R. 1361, p. 263; 1362, p. 391.

[20] Pat. R. Dec. 1, 1352, p. 393; Dec. 1, 1355, p. 332; Oct. 30, 1360, p. 456.

associated with an abbot or prior for each county of the realm.[21] Practically the same arrangement obtained in the collection of the Ninths for 1341, when thirty-eight priors and abbots acted with one hundred and forty laymen.[22] Sharp practices were sometimes used by these collectors. A commission appointed in 1346 was ordered to investigate the charge that the collectors and receivers of wool had taken greater weight than their commission called for, and had proceeded to sell this for their own profit.[23] One prior at least was caught in these dishonorable tricks—the prior of Wynundham and his fellows in rendering their account to the king "concealed great sums."[24] The abbot of Torre was also charged with having converted to his own use "diverse sums of money" received from the Ninth beyond the sum for which he and his colleagues rendered account to the exchequer.[25] The abbot of Leyston, collector of the Ninth for Suffolk, seems to have resorted to the same devices since the "king has pardoned him for any oppressions, extortions, trespasses, and concealments committed by him by color of such office."[26] Probably similar extortions account for the fact that a "confederacy assaulted some deputies and servants of the abbot of Bruerne, one of the assessors, sellers and collectors of the ninths of sheaves . . . whom he had sent to collect the ninth for the king, took away three carts and nine horses of the abbot and by force prevented the abbot from levying the same."[27]

It is not necessary, however, in accounting for their unpopularity, to prove that all these collectors, religious and lay, were tricksters or oppressors. The history of taxation abundantly shows that the collector, however honorable and just he may be, compromises himself in collecting an unpopular toll. Public opinion does not discriminate between the integrity of the collector and the injustice of the tax. There is clear evidence that during the period of the pestilence and indeed earlier, Englishmen were murmuring against Edward's exactions. Taxes were difficult to collect.[28]

[21] Pat. R. Oct. 4, 1334, p. 39f.

[22] Pat. R. March 15, 1341, p. 151.

[23] Pat. R. May 23, 1346, p. 115.

[24] Pat. R. Aug. 1346, p. 184.

[25] Pat. R. July 20, 1346, p. 185.

[26] Pat. R. Oct. 8, 1345, p. 559.

[27] Pat. R. July 3, 1341, p. 316.

[28] In January, 1351, in Worcester, the king understood that "some refuse to pay their portions of the tenths and fifteenths, and resist by force the making of distraints for arrears . . . and that bailiffs of liberties, cities and boroughs, and under-collectors

With public sentiment thus chafing under the burden of royal exactions it can readily be understood that the monasteries, in associating themselves with the collection of this royal revenue, were running dangerous chances of compromising themselves with the unreasoning populace. This is not idle speculation. At least 17 of the collecting monasteries were among the number of those assaulted by the people.

A third factor to be reckoned with in explaining the violence to which the alien priories in particular were subjected was the royal appointment of their custodian.[29]

While monastic provisions declined, parochial appropriations increased. People evidently found in the parish churches something that appealed to their benevolent impulses. Probably this was the chantry or the provision made for chaplains to pray for the dead. It was fortunate for the parish churches that during the third and fourth decades of the century, they had fostered the chantry movement. The mortmain licenses reveal the fact that in the matter of chantries the parish churches were better equipped than their rival monastic chapels. Even when the monastery received money to devote to chantry purposes it often was stipulated by the donor that the chantry should be attached to some parish church. Hence it came to pass that in the crisis when the religious houses found their prestige failing, they had the additional misfortune of being overshadowed by the secular clergy in the matter of an institution which the psychology of the moment was elevating into preëminence.

---

of the tenth and fifteenth in many towns and places are negligent and also do not obey them . . . whereby the money cannot be got in." (Pat. R. Jan. 6, 1351, p. 20.) In the county of Leicester the deputy collector of tenths and fifteenths was murdered by evil doers. (Pat. R. April 12, 1353, p. 455.) In the Hundred of Portsdoun, the collectors were "disturbed by force." (Pat. R. May 1, 1354, p. 37.)

[29] When the king appointed ". . . to seize into his hands the priory of Bergeveny . . . that he should receive the issues and goods of the same, certain men forcibly entered the priory and its possessions and disposed of the goods in these at their will." (Pat. R. Jan. 26, 1344, p. 275.) "Whereas the king committed to . . . prior of St. James by Exeter, the custody of his priory . . . Imbert, prior of Barnstable . . . (several other priors and monks) . . . to expel him from his custody took him at Croydon, thence to Bermundeseye, imprisoned him . . . and afterwards took him to France to the king's enemies who received him from them and detained him in prison until he made fine for his deliverance." (Pat. R. March 24, 1344, p. 289.) "Whereas the king by letters-patent lately committed to . . . prior of Tykeford the keeping of the said priory . . . some evil doers assaulted the prior, and the monks and priests . . . as well as the men and servants." (Pat. R. Nov. 28, 1355, p. 332.)

In such an emergency, it was easy to justify a resort to church impropriations. This was a plan by which the appropriating house at practically no additional outlay (the vicar being taken from the monastery) was able to increase its revenue to the extent of the tithes and offerings of the appropriated parish. That this amount was not inconsiderable is clearly shown in the ratings of the mortmain licenses. Northam, stood at £14-15-2; Weresbe, at 20 marks; Hakeney, at 50 marks; St. John Baptist, Steynton at £20-13-4.[30] Hedenham was worth £80; Leverington, £85; Somersham, £35.[31] These figures are illustrative of the great range in values, dependent in the nature of the case, upon the size and resources of the parishes. When full allowance is made for the inflation of rating values, and the diminished revenue that must have accompanied the pestilence, even a comparatively insignificant appropriation was a windfall to a religious house struggling to make ends meet.

It is not surprising to find a very sudden and substantial rise in the number of appropriations immediately after the plague. Among the mortmain licenses alone, there were 73 in the five years between 1350 and 1354 compared with 34 in the preceding and 27 in the subsequent four years. The Papal Petitions also show a rise, though not corresponding, in the concession of impropriations, in spite of the very manifest disinclination of the Pope to sanction a policy that to him seemed bad.

With characteristic courage Abbe Gasquet has undertaken to defend this policy of appropriating churches—"Except for the fact that tithe was taken from the district where it was raised, the grievance of which so much has been made is an academic rather than a real one, and one of modern invention rather than one existing in the Middle Ages. That there were complaints occasionally may be allowed. Still not only were they rare, but in the Episcopal Registers, it may be seen that in a few instances in which they come before the bishop they were declared to be groundless."[32] In reply it is sufficient to observe that what the Abbé condones as only an evil of "modern invention" figures in contemporary sources as a practice wholly reprehensible, to be resorted to only under extenuating circumstances and within clearly defined conditions.[33]

[30] Pat. R. March 13, 1351, p. 62; Aug. 8, 1352, p. 309; March 7, 1352, p. 239.
[31] Pap. Pet. I: 175.
[32] Gasquet, *Parish Life in Medieval England*, p. 17.

When the Pope sanctioned appropriations, almost invariably the concession distinctly stated that "a fitting vicar's portion shall be reserved"; sometimes the amount of the portion being inserted in the papal grant.[34] The system of impropriations was regarded even by contemporary thought as at best a necessary evil that had to be regulated by stringent limitations.

In the chapter preceding, as illustrative of prevailing economic depression, reference was made to the "recognizances" that were issued against the religious houses. When the monks had marketed every available product,[35] secured remissions from the king, and appropriated churches, they were still in need of money. Borrowing was their last resort. These recognizances represent the loans negotiated by houses during this period of hard times.

It is significant to observe that only three judgments were executed on behalf of religious houses.[36] Making due allowance for disinclination on the part of these religious institutions to resort to the courts for settlement of debts, these few judgments in the long list of over one hundred suggest that the treasuries of the monasteries were so exhausted that one institution was unable to help another. With parsons and chaplains it is almost the same—just ten of the former and three of the latter received judgments and in all save two, the amount involved

[33] When the Earl of Huntingdon sought confirmation for a monastery, and appropriations therefore, he took pains to state that "by these appropriations, the religious obtained corporal possession of their fruits and proceeds, saving two large vicar's portions." (Pap. Pet. I:50.) "The parish church of Cobeham is appropriated to the prior and convent of Bermondeseye and the vicar's portion is so small that no one will or can serve it . . . and the church and buildings are in a ruinous state." (Pap. Pet. I:492.) Richard, Bishop of Durham, "signifies that in his diocese is a fat parish church . . . which when void has been collated by bishops of Durham at the instance of kings and queens of England, to courtiers, insufficient and light persons, who turn the income to lacivious and profane uses and he desires that the income may be spent on the increase of divine worship and the good of the state in those parts which need lettered men." (Pap. Pet. I:25.) The countess of Pembroke "prays that whereas the three churches . . . were appropriated to the College of Valence Mary, and whereas the diocesans are wont in their own interests to burden appropriated churches and to limit excessively the vicar's portions, the founders and scholars pray that the Bishop of London, or some other English prelate, not of the said dioceses, be commissioned to adjust and limit the vicar's portions and the bishop's dues." (Pap. Pet. I:410.)

[34] Pap. Pet. I:121, 29, 42, 85.

[35] Pat. R. Nov. 16, 1350, p. 18.

[36] The prior of Llanthony and the abbot of Bonrepos helped Wynchecome and Sautre respectively.

was small. The Bishops of Winchester and London and the dean of St. Paul's are the only representatives of the higher secular clergy. With the clerks the situation changes. Forty-eight judgments appear in their favor. The frequent recurrence of three or four names suggests that some of these clerks had become professional money lenders. The nobility is represented by the Earl of Huntingdon and the Duke of Lancaster. Nine knights appear among the creditors. But by far the heaviest creditors were certain "citizens of London"—Hatfield, "citizen and draper"; Bache, "merchant"; Guldeford, "draper"; Hiltoft, "citizen and goldsmith"; Fraunceys, "citizen and merchant"; Rokele, "citizen and corderer"; Horewold, "citizen and spicer"; Pynselegle, "citizen"; Hatfield, "potter"; Brun, "citizen and wool maker"; Husebond, "citizen and cornmonger"; Double, "citizen and fishmonger"; Burstall, "citizen and vintner"; Merton of York, "ironmonger."

The following table summarizes the distribution of judgments:

Judgments in favor of parsons and chaplains	9
Number of creditors involved	13
Judgments in favor of knights	7
Number of creditors	9
Judgments in favor of nobility	3
Number of creditors	2
Judgments in favor of higher clergy	6
Number of creditors	6
Judgments in favor of clerks	48
Number of creditors	26
Judgments in favor of London citizens	45
Number of creditors	32
Judgments in favor of unclassified individuals	32
Number of creditors affected	46

It is noteworthy that only once does a Society appear—the Society of Malbayl, from which Certeseye borrowed 800 gold florins of Florence.[37] There are only two names that indicate foreign citizenship. Four women claim distinction among these lenders, and three wives are associated with their husbands.

It is clear that in many cases these judgments were executed by distraint upon the properties of the religious houses. The following

[37] Cl. R. July 6, 1351, p. 373.

table indicates the number of distraints and the value of the property involved.

	Distraints	Value
1349	3	£320
1350	7	£560
1351	26	£4441, 666M.
1352	13	£1515, 1440M.
1353	5	£240, 60M.
1354	11	£736, 1002M.
1355	3	£348
1356	3	£212
1357	7	£394, 50M.
1358	9	£633
1359	2	£20
1360	4	£901
1361	5	£448, 20M.
1363	3	£440

When it is remembered that the distraint of goods then as now usually necessitated a forced sale, it becomes apparent that these 93 judgments involving over £13,000 of property imposed no inconsiderable loss upon the monasteries.

The fact, however, that there were only 93 distraints implies that in some instances the judgment was followed by a settlement. In such cases as that of Eynesham, Lesnes, and St. Bartholomew which were continually getting into trouble, one judgment was met by contracting a new loan elsewhere. To effect a settlement a compromise occasionally was made by creditors.[38]

Instead of compromising with payments made in instalments, some houses negotiated annuities with their creditors.[39]

[38] John Iperlyng, merchant of Newcastle, accepted 200 marks, paid in installments distributed over years in settlement of a 400 mark claim against the priory of Neubergh. The priory of Hurle liquidated a £32 judgment with 24 marks; St. Bartholomew paid £32 to cancel a £60 judgment; Oakebourne paid £20 in lieu of £40; Sele gave 50 marks to cancel a judgment of 100 marks; the abbot of Westminister cancelled two bonds for £440 given by a predecessor by paying £70. Cl. R. July 6, 1351, p. 373; April 7, 1356, p. 303; Feb. 21, 1354, p. 58; Aug. 12, 1354, p. 83; June 26, 1358, p. 522; May 23, 1352, p. 494.

[39] The prior of Arundel settled with William Carreu, clerk, a claim of 1000 marks with a yearly rent of 40 marks, to be paid until such time as Carreu secured a benefice, when there was to be a deduction in the rental equal to the value of the benefice. Cl. R. July 1, 1354, p. 81. The prior of Ellerton in lieu of £200 gave William Fenton a yearly rental for life of 20 marks; the abbot of Lesnes granted a yearly pension of

A third form of settlement was the disposal outright of some monastic holding.[40]

The last shift resorted to by embarrassed houses was leasings. Even before the pestilence had made the problem of labor so acute and thereby reduced the earning power of land, there is evidence that leasing presented a solution for impoverished institutions.[41] It might have been expected that this policy would have assumed even larger proportions after the plague had made the manors more unremunerative. But the documents do not show a large number of these leases. It must not be forgotten however, that royal sanction to leases was necessary only in the case of lands "held in chief" and that therefore relatively only a small proportion of the leases would have any record other than the contract between lessee and lessor. Moreover the sources themselves intimate that the necessary formality of royal sanction to a lease was sometimes overlooked or ignored. With these considerations in mind it is possible that the few cases recorded in the sources are representative of a much larger leasing movement that the small number suggests.[42]

£20 for life to Robert Wendout in settlement of a £100 bond; the prior of St. Bartholomew gave Burstall in lieu of £200, a pension for life of £13 with the use also of a plot of land. The abbot of St. Mary's Stratford pledged Richard Chaddeslee, clerk, a yearly rent for life of £40 to be received from certain specified manors in order to settle a claim of £200. Such bargains as these indicate how hopelessly some houses had fallen into the clutches of grasping creditors. It was evidently a grim necessity to settle at any cost no matter how heavily the future might be mortgaged. Cl. R. Oct. 23, 1354, p. 91. Pat. R. Jan. 19, 1357, p. 335; June 5, 1358, p. 512.

[40] To settle once for all for their farm to the king, the prior of Lesnes surrendered advowsons of churches worth 200 marks per year. The abbot of Westminster surrendered to the Society of Malbayl two parish churches in order to meet a loan of 800 florins contracted by one of his fellow monks. The abbot of Thame satisfied his creditors by giving them timber and wood privileges for ten years. The prior of Okebourne released to the king in settlement of 800 marks a messuage situated in London. The abbot of Grestain demised for a thousand years several manors; the prior of St. Mary Mortmain, two manors for twenty years. Cl. R. Aug. 20, 1350, p. 242. Cl. R. July 26, 1352, p. 502. Cl. R. Jan. 26, 1355, p. 178. Cl. R. July 26, 1352, p. 502. Pat. R. Nov. 1, 1354, p. 158. Cl. R. March 19, 1361, p. 255.

[41] The king compassionating the estate of Bilsyngton "on account of their slender resources and the infinite cost of necessary drainage" licensed a lease in perpetuity of forty acres. (Pat. R. Nov. 22, 1337, p. 555.) On their petition for relief of the estate of the abbey of Littele "royal sanction was given to lease extensive lands, and fisheries with their bondmen attached thereto. Burmundseye "to enable them to relieve their estate and discharge part of their debts leased the manor of Wodeford. (Pat. R. May 5, 1338, p. 59. June 12, 1340, p. 543.) "On account of pleas brought against

them by reason of debts wherein they are bound to divers creditors, and that they are coming to such poverty that unless they may demise some of their lands they will be unable to answer the farm which the king has committed to their custody," the priory of Lenton was licensed to proceed to the necessary manor leases. (Pat. R. June 20, 1342, p. 475.)

[42] The abbot of Beaulieu was licensed to lease for fifteen years the manor of Farendon . . . to enable him to pay his debts. (Pat. R. Feb. 28, 1351, p. 44.) Stanleye (known by the recognizances to have been in deep water) had sanction to lease for ten years a manor to whomsoever they will. Other properties it surrendered during the lifetime of its abbot. (Pat. R. Aug. 2, 1353, p. 480; May 29, 1354, p. 52; Oct. 12, 1365, p. 178; Feb. 5, 1364, p. 460. Cl. R. Nov. 25, 1362, p. 438.) An inspeximus of indenture shows that Avebury (another embarrassed house) leased a manor for twenty years. (Pat. R. Jan. 31, 1354, p. 4.) St. Savior, Burmundseye (scarcely ever out of trouble) leased two manors. (Pat. R. May 14, 1354, p. 43, 49.) Tykeford (also on the embarrassed list) secured a royal confirmation to a three-year lease. (Pat. R. July 5, 1355, p. 255.) The convent of Lancastre "for the needs of their house and in order that the farm of the priory may be more readily paid to the king, have let to . . . rents, services, and tithes. . . ." (Pat. R. Feb. 28, 1359, p. 615, 616.)

CHAPTER VI

The Decline of Discipline

It has been shown in an earlier chapter that at least six score heads of religious houses were swept away by the pestilence. It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that thousands of the "religious" within the monastic walls must have fallen in 1349-50. The religious houses were confronted therefore with the task of finding substitutes for those who had been carried away so suddenly.

But decimation within the immediate precincts of the religious houses does not represent the full proportion of this problem of finding recruits. The fact must not be overlooked that many of the Regulars were the incumbents of appropriated churches, and it is quite unreasonable to suppose that in a visitation which swept away so many of the clergy in actual parish duty, these should have escaped. So far as the alien priories are concerned, the royal presentations indicate institutions as follows:—Horton 5; Stoke 22; Wilmyngton 10; Lenton 13; St. Neots 18; Derhurst 6; Pritewell 12; St. Andrew (Northampton) 7; Wenlok 7; St. Frideswide (Oxford) 7; Eye 11. In view of the fact that the largest of the alien priories had few parish connections compared with the most of the domestic houses, it is obvious that the filling of these vacancies was no small problem in itself, and a very heavy incumbrance when added to the already existing task of dealing with the ravages of disease within the cloisters.

There is yet another factor that complicated the situation. However sharp the cleavage between Regulars and Seculars under normal circumstances, it seems clear that in the crisis precipitated by the pestilence, when the spiritual apparatus of the church through lack of priests seemed to be almost completely paralyzed, petty factional interests were thrust aside in a desire common to all the higher clergy at least, to maintain as efficiently as practicable the regular administration of the Sacraments. It will appear, therefore, in references to be presented a little later, that the Regulars were drafted for service usually devolving upon the Seculars. The dividing line was temporarily obscured.

The problem confronting the religious houses was therefore threefold —to fill the gaps caused by disease within the cloister itself; to maintain the incumbencies of the appropriated churches; and to relieve the Secu-

lars in some degree of their corresponding strain. Stated otherwise, the task of the houses was to replenish their forces decimated by disease, and drained by the demand not only for reserves to man the impropriated vacancies, but also for volunteers to cope with the larger religious crisis of the nation.

In grappling with this almost superhuman task, it is to be noted at the outset that the religious houses possessed a large body of reserves in the chaplains. These were priests employed by noblemen or other persons of distinction to say mass in the private chapel, or attached to "chapels of ease" established for the convenience of the people in widely extended parishes. To make provision for officials who rendered such accommodating services to the community at large, was a popular form of bequest. Between 1331 and 1349, the mortmain licenses show 708 such provisions for chaplains. Over 300 additional chaplains were provided for during this same period. Bequests to the monasteries were often specifically assigned to the chaplain already in service or to others to be added. Between 1334 and 1348, inclusive, there were at least 121 such appropriations of property to chaplains connected with the monasteries.

In an emergency that called for incumbents to fill important parish churches, the natural procedure was to shift these chaplains from private chapels and "chapels at ease," where their services were not imperatively demanded. Although in consequence the populace had greater distances to travel in meeting for worship, this expedient enabled the monastery to continue its ministry in the important impropriated benefices.

This, therefore, was the first step taken by the religious houses in wrestling with the problem. In the long columns of royal institutions that for the two years 1349-50 amounted to at least 1000, one finds scarcely a single exception to the collation of chaplains. The distribution stands approximately at 97 per cent for chaplaincy institutions, with the remaining 3 per cent distributed among clerks, parsons, deacons, and subdeacons. The procedure followed by the king in institutions is not clearly indicated. It is possible that he acted purely upon his own initiative making whatever selection he chose. Probably he followed the suggestion, or at least considered the sensibilities of the interested ecclesiastical parties. There is abundant evidence of the unpopularity of the royal custody of religious houses. Wisdom, therefore, may have suggested to Edward the advisability of palliating his detested overlordship by making appointments in harmony with the wishes of the

monasteries concerned. If this inference be correct, the royal institutions supply a clue to the procedure actually followed by the religious houses in general. The statistics given above would point, therefore, to the almost exclusive recourse that was made to chaplains as successors to the deceased incumbents.

But the problem created by mortality among the Regulars was far too great to be entirely solved by simply utilizing the reserve force of the chaplains. At the most, their numbers fell far short of what was required to fill the vacancies due to death. Additional recruits had to be secured from other quarters.

A second source of relief lay in a relaxation of the severe conditions imposed upon candidates for holy orders. By lowering the age requirement, it was possible to "lay violent hands upon a considerable number of well equipped and earnest men." It is not surprising, therefore, to find petitions addressed to the Pope requesting this relaxation.[1]

[1] "Whereas by reason of the recent epidemic many of the monks have died, the abbot and convent of Reading pray for faculty to have thirty monks in their twentieth year, ordained priests by any Catholic bishop for the service of their monastery, and places subject to it." (1355) (Pap. Pet. I:282.) "Whereas by reason of the epidemic, there is a great lack of priests in the monastery and its dependent cells, Thomas, Abbot of St. Albans, prays for faculty to dispense twenty monks aged twenty so as to be promoted to all holy orders." (June, 1363) (Pap. Pet. I:425.) "Whereas on account of the late pestilences there is a lack of priests in his diocese, Thomas Bishop of Carlisle prays for faculty to dispense forty persons secular and regular aged twenty, so that they may be promoted to all holy orders and minister in the same." (July, 1363) (Pap. Pet. I:437.) Nicolas, prior of Norwich, requested a dispensation for twenty monks to minister at twenty years, and received grant for ten. (August, 1363) (Pap. Pet. I:445.) "Whereas by reason of the epidemic and pestilence, there is a great scarcity of priests, the abbot of St. Mary's, York, prays for faculty to dispense six of his monks under age to be ordained." (August, 1363) (Pap. Pet. I:445.) The prior and chapter of Durham sought "power to dispense twenty-four monks aged twenty to be ordained priests, there being by reason of the pestilences a great lack of priests." (Nov., 1363) (Pap. Pet. I:464.) "Whereas by reason of the pestilences there is a great lack of chaplains in the order, the abbots of Waltham, Leicester, and the prior of Gissburn, presidents of the Augustinians of England, pray for license to dispense forty persons, twenty years old, so as to be ordained and celebrate divine offices." (Feb., 1364) (Pap. Pet. I:480.) The abbot of Kingswoode, Worcester, secured a grant to dispense twelve professed monks aged twenty-two, as a compromise with the age of twenty. (April, 1364) (Pap. Pet. I:483.) "Whereas in the recent epidemic nearly all the elders and priests in divers monasteries and religious houses in England have died, and there is a great dearth of chaplains to serve churches, so that divine worship is no little diminished, the bishop of Worcester prays for faculty to dispense forty persons regular and secular, aged twenty, so as to be ordained priests." (Granted for twelve regulars aged twenty-two, June, 1364.) (Pap. Pet. I:502.) John, Abbot of St.

It is a curious fact that these petitions, with one exception, are all concerned with the minor visitation of 1361, rather than the great pestilence of 1349. This is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that the Seculars, in the years 1349-51 kept continually petitioning the Pope to lower the age requirements of their candidates, and to waive the conditions of celibacy and legitimate birth. Yet it was not until 1355 that this request was made by the Regulars, nor was it again pressed until 1363.

Why did the monasteries not seek earlier to utilize novices under age, or why, not having enlisted these young men during the stress of 1349 to 1355, did they depart from this policy in the year of the lesser epidemic, 1361 to 1365? It is not correct to say that the chaplains having filled all the vacancies, there was no need for dispensing candidates. Scores of clerks and nondescripts were collated to benefices that were going begging for incumbents. The demand certainly did exist, and was even more pronounced than in 1362 when so many dispensations were issued. Neither does it help to suggest that a change of popes from Innocent VI to Urban V may reflect a different policy toward this question of dispensing young men. The surprising fact is that the stricter and more conservative occupant of Peter's chair was the one who was more liberal in waiving technicalities in the case of youthful clerics. Finally, one cannot believe that the monasteries themselves were so scrupulously devoted to tradition, as to be unwilling to countenance a slight irregularity that would enable clerics to minister as priests. But, granted that they were, the question only assumes another form—Why did they change their attitude in 1362?

In this dilemma, may it not be questioned whether the religious houses in the earlier part of the fourteenth century had been attracting young men to their cloisters? Is it possible that the cloister had lost its appeal so far as young men were concerned? May it be inferred that it was the crisis of 1350-1360 that turned young men's attention towards institutions that had lost their hold upon all save the mature and middle aged; and that these in part were the young men of twenty and twenty-two, who in such large numbers were "dispensed" in the second visitation of 1361?

The imperative demand for Regular recruits had been partially met by enlisting chaplains, and in the later crisis by "dispensing" young

Edmund's de Byr, requested "faculty to dispense twenty of his monks aged twenty so that they may be ordained priests, there being a great lack of priests by reason of the recent mortality." (Feb., 1366) (Pap. Pet. I:513.)

monks. But there still remained many vacancies. A splendid opportunity remained for sordidness to prey upon the vacancies of monastic appropriated benefices. These could be exploited to the advantage of Court hangers-on, and the ambitious, discontented underlings of the clerical profession. Materialism coveted the fat income of these benefices. Hence the flood of appeals to the Pope at Avignon, made at first not directly by individuals in their own behalf, but indirectly through the intercession of powerful patrons who were probably only too glad to settle all outstanding accounts of service and friendship with the cheap currency of their patronage. Obviously the bishops were well within their rights when they availed themselves of this privilege of petition, but unfortunately their patronage was given indiscriminately to their secretaries, clerks, members of their households, and companions. With innocent candor the Bishop of Hertford pleaded on behalf of his 'dear friend and companion . . . from whom he has received many services and honors for a dispensation to accept two benefices with a cure of souls, notwithstanding that he has the church of Domynton." The faculties in Oxford and Cambridge solicited benefices for their students. The Pope was bombarded with intercessions not only from the king but from members of his immediate family circle, scions of nobility, royal royal administrative officials, envoys, ambassadors, knights and barons. A few of these patrons, exclusive of the king and the bishops, were Edward, Prince of Wales; Queen Philippa; the dowager Queen Isabella; Joan, Princess of Wales; Henry, Earl of Lancaster; the Countess of Pembroke; the Earl of Warwick, king's marshal; Michael Northburgh, king's secretary; Henry la Zouche, king's treasurer; Bartholomew Burgherch, king's chamberlain; John Swinnlee, master of the king's infants; the Earl of Huntingdon; the Earl of Suffolk; the Earl of Stafford; Guy de Brien, knight and envoy; the Duke of Brittany; William Burton, knight; John Grey, companion of Lancaster; William Harold, Donsel of the Earl of Arundel.

It is amusing to hear the bishops occasionally growling because in the multitude of patrons they were not able to do all that they otherwise would. Competition was so keen that the members of their households were overshadowed by Court favorites.[2]

[2] The Bishop of Winchester "unable by reason of those who expect benefices by papal authority to make provision to his servants, of suitable benefices, prays for faculty to confer two benefices apiece on six persons." Urban had to compromise at four "provided they are masters of theology and doctors of civil or canon law." (Pap. Pet. I:393.) "Whereas on account of the number of those who expect benefices under

Another factor complicated the situation for the bishops by the time that the visitation of 1361 accentuated afresh the need for clergymen. Candidates were going directly to Avignon in order to solicit benefices—"Rome-seeking priests and chaplains."[3] Compared with the candidates of the earlier pestilence, these seem to have been superior men being in large measure university graduates and "poor priests." And to their petitions Urban V was favorably disposed. It is therefore quite possible that what the bishops were smarting under was not so much the patronage permitted at Avignon to social and political magnates of unworthy clients, but rather the success with which the "Rome-seeking priests and chaplains" were getting into vacant benefices. From the diminished numbers of petitions presented by courtiers and noblemen after 1360, it seems that places had been secured for almost all their aspiring friends, and therefore the bishops would have had the field entirely to themselves had it not been for these insistent petitioners who passed them by and secured what they wanted by going directly to Urban V himself.

In analyzing the character of these new incumbents, it appears that the religious houses were drawn into several of the evils that had fastened upon the church's organization. In many cases the petitioners already held some preferment, and their successful appeal only added another to the long list of pluralities. The large number of benefices conferred upon students indicates to what alarming proportions the evil of non-residence had grown. One cannot fail to notice to what an extent the patronage of these religious houses was under the control of those entirely unconnected with these institutions themselves. The anomalous basis upon which the patron rested his appeal shows how thoroughly divested of all moral and spiritual prestige in the public mind at least, the priestly office had become.[4]

Having endeavored to show how the religious houses solved the problem of vacancies in their churches, it remains to be seen how the places of

---

papal letter, Simon, Bishop of London, is unable to make provision to his servants and friends, prays for faculty to provide for six persons." (Granted.) (Pap. Pet. I:408.) "Whereas on account of those who expect benefices under papal letters, John, bishop-elect of Lincoln, is unable to make provision for masters of theology, doctors and licentiates of canon and civil law and others his servants, he prays for faculty to make provision to three such persons and to three others of his choice." (Granted.) (Pap. Pet. I:413.)

[3] See a long list of such Pap. Pet. I:426f.

[4] For a schedule illustrating the incumbency of representative monasteries, the reader is referred to the Appendix, p. 96.

deceased heads and brothers were filled. The vacant headships of the hospitals claim first attention.

While it would be a slight exaggeration to say that the wardenship of all hospitals was under the exclusive control of the king,[5] yet this claim may be made certainly for the overwhelming majority. And although there are indications that sometimes this royal prerogative of appointment was ignored or even defiantly repudiated by the deans and chapters, it is clear that the king was very loath to suffer any trespassing upon his patronage.[6] The reason is not difficult to discern. Through these vacancies he was able to gratify the mercenary appetite of a few of his numerous body of officials, who in addition to the legitimate perquisites of office might appropriate to themselves the "tithes, mortuaries, small tithes, oblations, and other offerings of the altars of the churches belonging to the hospital with the reliefs and fines and other profits of the Court of the Hospital."[7] Such at least was the royal policy in the rapacious times of the pestilence. With scarcely an exception, the king handed over these hospital wardenships to his clerks. In two cases he appointed brothers from the headless house and in one a chaplain.[8] Usually his clerks received the custodianships. There is abundant evidence that some of these officials made full traffic of the mercenary possibilities of their trust.[9]

[5] Pat. R. Jan. 20, 1350, p. 468; Aug. 12, 1361, p. 50.

[6] Pat. R. May 8, 1336, p. 266f.

[7] Pat. R. May 8, 1336, p. 266f.

[8] Pat. R. 1359, p. 260, 368. Pat. R. 1361, p. 54.

[9] Let the following be cited—"It has been found by inquisition that divers corrodies for life have been granted to divers men out of the hospital (St. Bartholomew, Gloucester) by Nicolas, late prior of the hospital . . . and that divers sums of money, jewels, corn, vessels of silver and of brass, beds and other utensils to the value of £100 given and bequeathed to the use of the brothers and sisters and the poor in the hospital, which came into the hands of the said prior and John Redford and William Baker, his confreres, are dissipated and detained by them, and other wastes and destruction of the goods of the hospital were done by the said late prior." (Pat. R. May 3, 1358, p. 74f.) Commission . . . "to make a visitation of the hospital of St. Leonard's, Derby, as the king understands that Robert Sandeford, the warden, does not attend to the keeping and rule thereof, but has dissipated the goods and possessions and alienated the lands and rents or demised them for life or terms of years, and so what was of old set apart for pious uses is converted to profane uses." (Pat. R. April 1, 1351, p. 84.) Commission . . . "to survey the state of the hospital of St. Mary Magdalene, Ripon, which is said to be greatly decayed by misrule . . . to make inquisition by the oath of good men of the county of York as to the defects in the hospital the bearing of the warden, brethren and sisters, and the squandering of the goods and alienation of the lands thereof." (Pat. R. Sept. 15, 1352, p. 342.) Commission . . . "to make a

It would seem that not a few of the hospitals suffered seriously from the delinquencies of keepers appointed subsequent to the pestilence. In a crisis demanding wardens, capable not only of financing amid the most acute depression, but also of maintaining efficiency in a period of pronounced moral and social deterioration, it was the misfortune of these hospitals to fall into the hands of too many whose incompetence was equalled by their unscrupulousness.

In the matter of headship, the monasteries had a protection which was denied to the hospitals. Beyond the technicalities of sanctioning the appointment of a successor, ratifying the selection, and surrendering the temporalities, the king had no rights in the filling of these vacant headships. There is no evidence, moreover, that in the embarrassment caused by such a sudden and widespread mortality among the abbots and priors, the king showed any disposition to complicate matters by unfairly using the technical privileges of his office. The appointments made by the chapters were almost invariably ratified by the king. Nor is there any evidence that the temporalities were withheld by unnecessary

visitation of the king's hospital of St. John the Baptist, Dorchester, which is reported to be greatly decayed by misrule, to examine the warden, brothers, and sisters in the premises singly, and to find by jury of the country of Dorset the whole truth of the matter." (Pat. R. Aug. 15, 1351, p. 159.) St. Leonard's, Derby, twelve years after its investigating commission as above, does not seem to have improved for another commission had to be appointed. "As the king understands that many of the lands, rents and possessions . . . have been withdrawn and alienated and otherwise dissipated and lost by the carelessness and negligence of the masters or wardens of the hospital, that the brothers, sisters, priests, ministers, officers, and persons thereof lead dissolute lives and do not attend to the divine offices . . . and that the pensions, oblations, rents, and emoluments which should have been used in repairing the defects and payments of the commons and stipends of the brothers, sisters, and other persons, and other charges are applied to other uses. . . ." (Pat. R. Feb. 10, 1365, p. 531.) Commission . . . "to make a visitation of the king's hospital of Neuton in Holderness . . . as the king is informed that the hospital is in a greatly decayed state through the negligence of the masters and wardens thereof." (Pat. R. May 6, 1364, p. 540.) An order was given to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer "touching the hospital of St. James near Westminster . . . as the king has learned that some lands and rents of the said hospital have been alienated by the presidents or others pretending themselves to be masters of the hospital." (Cl. R. Dec. 26, 1354, p. 49.) "Whereas the house of St. Giles by London . . . is so miserably depressed by dissensions between the brethren that its goods do not suffice to maintain the pious works with which it is charged, and it is feared that the dilapidations and depressions will grow greater, the king has taken the house into his special protection and committed the same to Geoffrey Burton, a brother of the house, to keep during pleasure." (Pat. R. May 8, 1367, p. 388.)

delay. This implies that vacant headships were filled in almost every case by monks promoted from the respective chapters, rather than by a translation from one monastery to another. The papal correspondence does not show more than a half dozen of such exchanges. This factor of translation may therefore be ignored.

But this policy of promotion from the ranks of each headless institution does not seem to have proven effective in providing leaders morally and administratively equal to the emergency. Although perhaps long connected with the monastery, some of these newly elected heads were too inexperienced to grapple successfully with a task that even to the wisest and most mature was almost superhuman. Hence the oft-repeated reference to "misrule," which, however, must always be interpreted in the light of the extraordinary circumstances that faced these men who under normal conditions probably would have rendered a good account as administrators.

On the other hand, although these heads had been appointed by colleagues who might reasonably have been expected to recognize and to elect only worthy leaders, there is convincing evidence that many of the appointees were utterly unworthy of a trust which they prostituted through systematic self-aggrandizement and exploitation. In securing their promotion, it is possible, of course, that they may have deceived their colleagues as to their real motives and aspirations; also that there was considerable intrigue connected with chapter elections. Moreover, it must be conceded that in many cases death had left few from whom to make a choice. It is also possible that men who, when promoted, were really worthy of their appointment deteriorated in this trying time. Be this as it may, the reader may draw conclusions for himself from the data below.[10]

[10] "Inasmuch as the Abbey of St. Augustine, Welhowe, by Grimsby, is at present burdened with debt and is in a miserably depressed state for lack of good rule, the king has taken the same into his custody." Nine years later conditions had not materially improved for another appointment of royal custodians appeared. (Pat. R. July 6, 1350, p. 550; Oct. 15, 1359, p. 292; Oct. 20, 1365, p. 170.) "Protection for the Abbey of Breuera . . . now grievously burdened with debt on account of misrule and casualties and appointment of royal custodians. Four years later "it is now by misrule and accidental adversity threatened with debt." (Pat. R. March 24, 1351, p. 62; May 8, 1354, p. 39.) In 1366, in spite of royal custodians, "through misrule and the carelessness of past presidents it is so miserably depressed by corrodies granted to suspected persons of foul character that the divine worship has ceased . . . and there is danger of a dispersal of the monks through lack of sustenance." (Pat. R. May 14, 1366, p. 244; Feb. 5, 1364, p. 462.) "Inasmuch as the abbey of Lilleshull . . . is so burdened with debt by misrule that the goods are not sufficient to pay the creditors, the king has taken

In seeking to determine whether this monotonous record of misrule is to be attributed to incompetency, to inexperience, or to moral delinquency, it is to be noted that there is nowhere any attempt to condone it. The extenuating circumstance of inexperience is adduced in only one instance.[11] And here it is significant that the "men of knowledge and

---

the abbey into his own hand. . . ." (Pat. R. Nov. 8, 1351, p. 177.) "Protection with clause nolumus during pleasure for the abbey of Wynchecombe . . . which by misrule is now heavily burdened with debt and appointment with consent of . . . bishop of Worcester and by request of the abbot and convent . . . of royal custodians." (Pat. R. July 24, 1353, p. 481.) Commission to "survey the state of the abbey of Battle . . . the goods whereof are reported by default of rule and inexcusable insufficiency and neglect of some of the abbey dilapidated and wasted to the great depression of the state and possible ruin of the abbey. . . ." (Pat. R. May 8, 1353, p. 440.) "Protection during pleasure for the abbots of Abbodesbury . . . which by default of rule by the abbot is now burdened with debt and depressed by other causes so that the goods are insufficient for the maintenance of the convent and the payment of the debt." (Pat. R. Dec. 1, 1353, p. 536.) The priory of Dover, which also "for default of good rule is so wasted in its possessions and fallen away in its faculties that there is no relief of it" was united by royal license to the priory of Christs, Canterbury. (Pat. R. May 20, 1356, p. 379.) Tackele "which is so depressed by neglect and the ill government of the priors and keepers before their time that the means do not suffice for the payment of the farm" received a respite for three years. (Cl. R. June 18, 1359, p. 627.) A commission was appointed to make inquisition concerning Stanleye "as the king is given to understand that lands conferred on the abbey, for chantries and other works of piety, have been alienated by the present abbot to many of the county, whereby the chantries and works of piety have been wholly withdrawn." Later the abbot retired "and his favorers and accomplices having been removed" the king took into his special protection "the present abbot and monks who for fear of those removed dare not labor about their business, taking evils inflicted on them by these in the past as a presage of evils to come." (Pat. R. Dec. 14, 1363, p. 452; June 30, 1365, p. 133, 134.) Tarente "on account of misrule and the carelessness of past presidents as also on account of accidental fire is so miserably depressed that the divine worship has ceased and there is danger of the dispersal of the nuns there through lack of sustenance unless some remedy be quickly applied." (Pat. R. May 18, 1366, p. 239.) St. Augustine, Bristol, "being depressed by corrodies sold and conferred on persons suspected of ill-fame, and by profitless leases of its possessions, as also by the excessive and fruitless expenses of the presidents thereof" was committed to royal keepers. (Pat. R. April 1, 1366, p. 225.) The abbey of Bordesle "on account of misrule and the carelessness of past presidents is so miserably depressed and burdened by excessive corrodies and debts, that divine worship has ceased . . . and there is danger of the dispersal of the monks there through lack of sustenance." (Pat. R. May 15, 1366, p. 245.)

[11] The king in discharging the abbot of Croxton of the task of collecting the Tenth learned "that the abbey was in great part destroyed by the burning of the church and other houses, and was afterwards deprived by the plague of those by whose knowledge and ability it was then governed except the abbot and prior." (Cl. R. Nov. 16, 1352 p. 336.

ability" were not alone the abbot and prior, but also the monks—in other words, the very class from whom in the vast majority of instances the heads newly-elected were chosen. The serious defect in these men was not their inexperience, so much as their lack of moral qualities. This explains why the palliating circumstance of incompetence is so rarely referred to in connection with misrule.

In drawing a conclusion so adverse to these heads, their mismanagement is not the only feature taken into consideration. On every hand one finds oneself face to face with data from which this unfavorable estimate of character seems to be the only reasonable inference. Perhaps the most severe arraignment of these incumbents is their inglorious prominence in the raiding parties which formed such a characteristic feature of the period. It is not at all uncommon to find an abbot in command of a party that trampled down crops, rifled storehouses, and ended by assaulting and maiming servants.[12] Sometimes, indeed, it is an abbot who led his band against a fellow member of his order.[13] Occasionally law was completely set aside by these ruffian abbots. The prior of the hospital of St. John, Jerusalem, when summoned by the Bishop of London, assaulted a servant deputed to serve the citation, and then stole the summons. To cap the climax, he threw one of his creditors into a tank of water, keeping him there until he promised not to sue for any of his claims. Released, he was then assaulted and sent homeward upon a horse with ears and tail cut off.[14] The abbot of Mussynton was convicted of having "traitorously and felonously falsified and clipped the king's money" for which he was condemned to be drawn and hanged, though subsequently he was pardoned by royal grace.[15] The abbot of Torre with his fellow canons was charged with having stolen a ship worth £500.[16] The prior of Boxgrave was excommunicated for disobedience, and the abbot of Bruerne, remaining recalcitrant for forty days after an excommunication, had to be handled by the secular arm.[17] An obtruding abbot occupying the monastery of Bruerne, alienated granges, rents, and possessions so that instead of supporting sixty monks and as many brothers, its sustenance was reduced to provision for only six.[18] "That

[12] Pat. R. July 1, 1362, p. 283.
[13] Pat. R. Aug. 18, 1355, p. 297; Oct. 10, 1363, p. 447.
[14] Pat. R. May 9, 1357, p. 555f.
[15] Pat. R. Sept. 2, 1361, p. 59.
[16] Pat. R. May 8, 1363, p. 369.
[17] Pat. R. May 12, 1350, p. 506. Dugdale IV; 643.
[18] Pap. Pet. I:511.

he might the more freely give himself up to dissolute living," the abbot of St. Werburg, Chester, secured exemption from ordinary jurisdiction, until a protest was launched by his successor and lay brothers.[19] Manslaughter and possibly murder stand recorded against two—the guardian of the Friors Minor of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, who slew an apostate of his own order, and the abbot of Evesham, who was pardoned for taking the life of John Vaal.[20]

It is unnecessary to cite further instances. Any enumeration is inadequate and almost misleading in setting forth the misdemeanors and grave improprieties of these abbots and priors who stand condemned not alone by the standards of our age but also by the light of their own. In justice to them, however, a glance should be taken at the men associated with them in chapter fellowship. Some of these obviously as survivors of the pestilence had been influenced by the immorality and materialism that followed in the wake of the Black Death. On the other hand, large numbers of novices had stepped into the vacancies of the deceased. Probably a good proportion of these were young. The dispensations given in 1362 and later to men of twenty and twenty-two years of age indicate that youths in their "teens" had found their way into the depleted religious houses. Probably many of these were recruited from the large numbers of orphans thrown upon society by the pestilence. Their entrance may have been voluntary; perhaps it was forced upon them. An illuminating instance is in a petition which reads—"On behalf of Richard, son of John Thornton, citizen and spicer of York, it has been shown that he, when within the years of puberty, was lately ensnared and seduced by some friars of the House of Carmelite Friars in York, insomuch that by their persuasion he took the habit of the same friars in their house and they fraudulently induced him so that they made him profess the order within the years of puberty de facto, although of right they could not and although he, within the time of his puberty and before the fourteenth year of his age, laid aside the habit and went forth from the house and order as lawful was for him to do in this case.[21]

Through whatever pressure these lads were induced to enter the cloisters, their presence imposed upon the prior unusually onerous duties in the way of novitiate instruction. Hence the king excused the abbot and prior of Croxton from tax collecting duties because the "abbot is so infirm and so occupied in directing the affairs of the abbey, and the prior

[19] Pap. Pet. I:275.
[20] Pat. R. Feb. 6, 1357, p. 505; Feb. 15, 1365, p. 93.
[21] Pat. R. March 2, 1358, p. 18.

is so engaged upon the control of divine worship and of the novices received into the convent after the plague."[22]

In the light of the evidence respecting the unpopularity of the religious houses generally, it seems improbable that any large number of men came forth voluntarily to recruit the depleted ranks. A deep religious sentiment awakened by the pestilence probably influenced a few to turn towards the religious houses. Moreover, pressure of poverty and the rapacity of society may have driven others into the cloister. Unfortunately, it does not seem that the wholesome element predominated.

All that has been said concerning the delinquencies of the abbots and priors applies with equal force to their colleagues. They were abettors of the disgraceful raids conducted by their superiors. They stole without compunction, not only battering through the walls of granaries but even breaking into abbeys from which they carried away chalices and vestments. Even the sanctity of life itself was not respected, and the names of many canons appear upon the roll of those pardoned by royal clemency for slaying their fellows.

The one outstanding feature in the monastic life of this turbulent period is the disposition to cast aside the restraints of "regular discipline." In a large number of the houses, the monks assumed an attitude of rebellious insubordination. They abandoned their clerical garb and as vagabonds wandered about "in secular attire" until apprehended and delivered over to their own tribunals. This disposition to renounce their vows was not confined to a few. The following houses had vagabond monks:—Lenton, Evesham, Coventry, Battle, Sibton, Penteney, Brugton, Bynedon, Wenlok, Ivychurch, Selby, Lesnes, Wynchecombe, St. Bartholomew, Thetford, Bradwell, Bordesleye, Montacute, Burton, St. Lazarus, Ramsey, and the two nunneries of Kilburn and Haversholm.

Some houses in this list were the victims of misrule—Evesham, Battle, Bynedon and Bordsleye. Some of the deserters may have become disgusted with the moral conditions within a monastery, and their vagabondage may be charitably regarded as a protest against the order of things. In such cases the vagabond monk may have been a forerunner of the Lollard movement. In only one instance is it certain that the deserters belonged to the recruits who entered the houses after the pestilence. In Ivychurch, the records show that every monk died save one and that he was appointed prior. Nevertheless, two canons in 1358 were among the vagabonds. Possibly these were representative of a

large number who, having taken vows from worldly motives or superficial enthusiasm, soon wearied of restraint and reverted to their earlier manner of living.

Another observation that should be made concerning the list as given above is that it represents all Orders—Benedictines, Cistercians, Augustnians, Carmelites, the Holy Cross Friars, and the Friar Preachers.

To understand this outbreak of insubordination and secularism, it is well to remember that the life of the nation had been passing through a stage of iconoclastic unrest.[23] The religious houses were troubled by the prevailing spirit of discontent and unruliness of which the lapse into secular life and the solicitude of the authorities are symptoms.

Luke Wadding's estimate of the effects of the Great Plague upon the monasteries, though written three hundred years ago, is confirmed by the most recent research:—"This evil wrought great destruction to the holy houses of religion, carrying off the masters of regular discipline and the seniors of experience. From this time the Monastic Orders and in particular the mendicants began to grow tepid and negligent, both in that piety and that learning in which they had up to this time flourished. Then our illustrious members being carried off, the rigors of discipline relaxed by these calamities could not be renewed by the youths received without the necessary training rather to fill the empty house than to restore the lost discipline."[24]

[22] Pat. R. Nov. 16, 1352, p. 336.

[23] The Abbot of St. Edmund's complained that "whereas he has all manner of jurisdiction and correction of all persons ecclesiastic as well as secular, residing within the town of St. Edmund's . . . many of the same who have incurred sentences of excommunication, scorn to obey ecclesiastical censures." (Pat. R. June 20, 1353, p. 470.) The commissioners deputed by the archbishop of York to correct "some things found in his visitation" were assaulted in the exercise of their office and their visitation rolls were torn up and trampled upon. (Pat. R. July 1, 1367, p. 610.) The Bishop of Coventry and Litchfield, in seeking to correct abuses in the prior of Ranton, was prevented in the exercise of his jurisdiction by a mob who besieged him in the priory and later assaulted him on his way home." (Pat. R. May 22, 1357, p. 566.)

[24] Annales Minorum, viii, 22; see Gasquet *Black Death*, 251.

APPENDICES

I

Appeals for Aid

St. Alban's (P. P. 1: 172; P. R. May 5, 1350, p. 500)

"In consideration of the diminution by a fourth part of the fruits of the monastery by reason of the epidemic"

A church appropriation and release of pension

St. Mary's, Suleby (P. P. I: 166)

"small income and many debts"

Church appropriation

Godestowe (P. R. July 29, 1349, p. 361)

"by reason of the last voidance of the abbey"

Gift as a special grace of all the temporalities of the abbey

St. Margaret by Marleburgh (P. R. Jan. 12, 1350, p. 444)

"in consideration of leanness of the house and poverty of the priors and canons"

Mortmain license

Battle (P. P. I, 202; P. R. May 8, 1353, p. 440)

"has suffered by inundations and wars and is burdened with debts and has been brought low by the pestilence so that monks cannot exercise alms and hospitality"

Church appropriation

Drax (P. R. Feb. 1, 1350, p. 468)

"depressed in many ways in these days by frequent floods and other misfortunes"

Church appropriation

Suthwik (P. R. April 24, 1350, p. 495; Cl. R. Oct. 17, 1352, p. 444)

"out of compassion for their estate now depressed by the deadly pestilence and other causes . . . depression and penury by burning of houses of priory and other misfortunes"

Grant of temporalities in last voidance. Pardon of tenth

Llanthony (P. R. June 6, 1350, p. 510)

Protection and nolumus for three years

Lenton and Hemele (P. R. Feb. 6, 1350, p. 517)
"farms, rents and pensions are in arrears"
Royal collectors appointed

St. Mary, Lancaster, Ware (P. R. March-April 1350, p. 525)
"farms, rents and pensions are in arrears"
Royal collectors appointed

Noion-Neufnarche (P. R. March-April, 1350, p. 525)
"farms, rents and pensions are in arrears"
Royal collectors appointed

Tackeleye (P. R. March-April, 1350, p. 525)
"farms, rents and pensions are in arrears"
Royal collectors appointed

St. Leonard's, York (P. R. July 10, 1350, p. 542)
"who have not sufficient to live on unless relieved from without"
Protection and royal patronage

Minoresses of Deneye (P. R. July 7, 1350, p. 545)
Protection for two years

St. Augustine, Welhowe (P. R. July 6, 1350, p. 550; 1365, p. 170)
"burdened with debt and miserably depressed condition for lack of good rule"
Royal custodian

Fécamp (P. R. Nov. 16, 1350, p. 18; Nov. 12, 1358, p. 118)
"to help toward payment of his farm and building and repairing of mills and houses"
License to cut and sell oaks and other trees, also hay

St. Helen's, Bishopsgate (P. P. I: 198)
"church in danger of going to ruin"
Indulgences to donors

Arundel (P. R. Oct. 20, 1350, p. 2)
"arrears in farm"
Farm reduced

St. Nicholas, York (Cl. R. April 16, 1350, p. 215)
"divers rents withdrawn, some tenants refuse to pay rents"
Royal writ of aid

Lewes (Cl. R. Aug. 20, 1350, p. 242)
"unable to meet king's exactions"
King accepts advowsons

Bruera (P. R. March 24, 1351, p. 62)
"now grievously burdened with debt on account of misrule and casualties"
Protection and royal collectors to pay debts

Neustede (P. R. Feb. 5, 1351, p. 36)
"only a slight endowment"
Voidance exemption

Hulton (P. R. Feb. 20, 1351, p. 41; and 1354, p. 258)
"out of compassion for the poverty of this house"
Pardon of fine

Beaulieu (P. R. Feb. 28, 1351, p. 44)
"to enable him to pay debts on his house"
License to lease a manor

Wilmyngton (P. R. March 7, 1351, p. 52)
"the possessions thereof are so impoverished and diminished that the prior cannot pay his farm to the king without assistance"
License to fell and sell trees

Romeseye (nunnery) (P. R. April 7, 1351, p. 59; Cl. R. 1354, p. 102)
"whose estate is for various causes much depressed in these times"
"Lack of tenants through late pestilence"
Church appropriation

St. Faith, Horsham (P. R. April 5, 1351, p. 83)
"farm, rents, pensions in arrear"
Royal collector

Tackele (P. R. May 26, 1351, p. 98; June 2, 1358, p. 50)
"on account of the mortal pestilence lately prevailing, from which time their lands have remained untilled, and tenements wherefrom the rents of the priory arose have remained empty by the death of the tenants . . . no one dares to take any of the lands at farm for fear of the arrears of the said farm—now £168-13-4" Creditors are sueing
Royal pardon of arrears

Barlynges (P. R. June 23, 1351, p. 105)
"now impoverished by building their church and various other causes"
Remission of Tenth

St. Giles, London (P. R. May 1, 1351, p. 103; P. P. I, 270)
"who have not sufficient to live on unless assisted by faithful elsewhere" "by reason of horrible mortality, lands are uncultivated"
Protection for alm collectors

Caresbrok (P. R. June 25, 1351, p. 105)
Voidance exemption

St. Oswald's, Nostell, St. Ives, Stratford, Coggeshale, Clerkenwell, Berkying, Westminster, Stykeswold (P. R. June 13, 1351, p. 97-98)
"in consideration of very many subsidies made by the clergy of England, to the king in his necessities"
"Special royal protection that nothing of their tithes or goods shall be taken against their will by any ministers"

Pynham (P. R. Sept. 4, 1351, p. 197)
"for relief of the depressed state of their house"
Mortmain license

Lilleshull (P. R. Nov. 8, 1351, p. 177)
"so burdened with debt by misrule that goods are insufficient to pay creditors"
Royal custody to pay debts

Kirkeby Monachorum (P. R. Oct. 26, 1351, p. 165)
"rents and pensions . . . greatly in arrear"
Royal collector

St. John the Baptist, Dorchester (P. R. Aug. 15, 1351, p. 159)
"reported to be greatly decayed by misrule"
Visitation order

Paumfeld-Wells (Cl. R. April 7, 1351, p. 357)
"prior is at present so depressed by much adversity and by reason of the late pestilence and by various other chances that he cannot pay his ferm and arrears"
Respite for ferm and arrears

St. Peter, Winchester (P. R. Nov. 26, 1352, p. 372)
"in consideration of their poverty and want"
Royal pardon of unlicensed acquisitions

Haylyng (P. R. May 12, 1352, p. 263)
"prior not sufficient to find the sustenance and entire farm he has to pay . . . king compassionating the priory which is greatly depressed at present"

Release of arrears

Chesthunt (prioress) (P. R. Jan. 15, 1352, p. 195)
"in consideration of their great poverty in these days"

Release from tenths

Campeseye (prioress) (P. R. June 6, 1352, p. 295)

Pardon of the last tenth

Brydelyngton (P. R. June 18, 1352, p. 298)
"out of compassion for the present depressed state of the priory"

Pardon of unlicensed occupation

Castelacre (P. R. June 24, 1352, p. 302)
"in consideration of frequent subsidies to the king and of gratitude for these"

Protection

Durham (P. R. July 20, 1352, p. 314)
"in consideration of frequent subsidies to the king and of gratitude for these"

Protection

St. Michaels, Staunford (P. R. Aug. 30, 1352, p. 320)
"out of compassion for the present depressed state of the house"

Pardon of tenths

Hextildesham (P. R. Sept. 1, 1352, p. 327)
"in consideration of numerous subsidies to the king in his necessities"

Protection nolumus

Tremenhale (P. P. I: 229)
"goods are insufficient to support charges, which by reason of numbers of magnates who seek hospitality and the pestilence are so heavy that the prior is burdened with debt"

Church appropriation

St. Mary, Winchester (P. P. I: 230; Cl. R. 1354, p. 101)

"great losses by reduction of rents, barrenness of their lands, disforesting cattle, plague, destruction of buildings and other misfortunes so that . . . burdened with debt"

"lack of tenants lost in the late pestilence"

Church appropriation

Ledes (P. P. I: 232; Cl. R. March 6, 1352, p. 414)

"rents after the burning of their church of Chetham and other misfortunes are insufficient for their needs"

Church appropriation

St. Mary Magdalene at Ripon (P. R. Sept. 15, 1352, p. 342)

"said to be greatly decayed by misrule"

Royal visitation

Wenlok (P. R. Feb. 8, 1352, p. 219)

"out of compassion . . . who are come into such great poverty in these days that the lands of the priory in no wise suffice to maintain the alms and other charges"

Pardon of two hundred marks

Bynedon (P. R. 1352, p. 250, 353: 1357, p. 565)

"at present time so depressed by debts, by frequent attacks of the king's alien enemies, and coming there of mariners passing to foreign parts, that its goods suffice not for payment of debts"

Nolumus protection and royal custody

Kilburn(prioress) (P. R. Feb. 12, 1352, p. 250)

"out of compassion for their present excessive poverty"

Release from tenths talliages

St. Katherine, Colchester (P. R. Dec. 1, 1352, p. 366)

Rogamus protection

Clerkenwelle, (P. R. April 11, 1353, p. 424)

"who in these days are in too great poverty"

Pardon of fifteenth

St. Mary, Leicester (P. P. I: 226)

"have to spend much on hospitality and their revenues have suffered by the recent epidemic and other causes"

Church appropriation

St. James, Canterbury (prioress) (Cl. R. Nov. 17, 1352, p. 451)
"on account of the want of that house"
"lands are worth nothing beyond the maintenance of the prioress and sisters"
Pardon of wools and tenths

St. Bartholomew's, Oxford (Cl. R. Nov. 12, 1352, p. 453; Cl. R. 1355, p. 142)
has been given with houses, lands, rents, etc., to the House of St. Mary, Oxford "so slenderly endowed that goods suffice not"

St. Bartholomew's, London (Cl. R. March 14, 1352, p. 415)
"so slenderly endowed that goods have scarcely sufficed for the master and charges"
Release from wools and tenths

Newerk, St. Mary (Cl. R. July 5, 1352, p. 434)
"so slenderly endowed that goods have scarcely sufficed for the master and charges"
Release from wools and tenths

Abbottesbury (P. R. Dec. 1, 1353, p. 536)
"is now burdened by debt and depressed by other causes so the goods are insufficient for the sustenance of the convent and payment of debts"
Protection and royal custody to discharge debts

St. Thomas Martyr (P. R. Nov. 22, 1353, p. 529)
"who have not enough to live on unless relieved by the charitable"
Rogamus protection

Wynchecombe (P. R. July 24, 1353, p. 481; 1360, p. 468)
"which by misrule is heavily burdened with debt"
Nolumus protection and royal custody to discharge debts

Vaudey (P. R. March 12, 1353, p. 420)
"out of compassion for the depressed state of the priory
Remission of the tenth

Mussenden (P. R. March 24, 1353, p. 424)
"who have manifold charges by frequent coming of persons . . . and are impoverished by great dearth in past years"
Church appropriation

Barlynges (P. R. Feb. 4, 1353, p. 400)
"in relief of their estate greatly impoverished in these days"
Remission of tenth

Huntingdon (P. R. Jan. 27, 1353, p. 398)
"in consideration of many subsidies made to the king by the clergy"
Nolumus protection

Westminster (Cl. R. Feb. 15, 1353, p. 527)
"in collecting oboli, to set over against debts to the king"
Oboli claim granted

St. James, Northampton (P. R. May 16, 1354, p. 46)
"in relief of estate . . . greatly charged by some requests of the king"
Mortmain license

Lappeleye (P. R. Feb. 28, 1354, p. 11, 12)
"by sudden burning up of the entire manse of the priory . . . and other adversities it is so impoverished, that no prospect for a long time of relief of his estate"
Pardon of arrears of farm

Wytham (P. R. Jan. 10, 1354, p. 17)
"because their servants and household in the last pestilence died totally . . . and their lands remains for the most part untilled and their crops perished miserably not gathered in"
Statute of Laborers relaxed

Blyth (P. R. March 18, 1354, p. 19)
"many farms, debts, and rents in arrears"
A royal collector

Wythup (P. R. March 11, 1354, p. 27)
"whereas the house is slenderly endowed and by the pestilence lately prevailing . . . is brought into such great poverty that all the nuns with one exception are dispersed on account of the penury and the house of itself cannot rise again"
To unite with St. Michael by Staunford

Breurne (P. R. May 8, 1354, p. 39)
"now by misrule and accidental circumstances threatened with ruin by debt and otherwise"
Protection and royal custody

St. Frideswyde (P. R. May 20, 1354, p. 51)
"by misrule and adversities as by debts"
Royal custody

Feriby (P. R. May 30, 1354, p. 72)
"in consideration of present depressed state of the priory"
Pardon of tenths

St. Martins, Dover, (Cl. R. May 24, 1354, p. 23)
"so poor that it does not suffice in these days for the food and ministers serving God there"
Pardon of the tenths

Canterbury H. (Cl. R. Jan. 24, 1354, p. 28)
"so slenderly endowed . . . not suffice to pay"
Pardon of tenths

St. Mary, H. Great Yarmouth (P. P. I: 263)
"a multitude of poor for whose sustenance a daily quest has to be made"
Relaxation of penance to donors

Lenomynstre (P. R. July 7, 1355, p. 259)
"arrears of farm"
Pardon of arrears. Reduction of farm

St. Bartholomew by Sudbury (P. R. July 8, 1355)
"for relief of poor cell of Westminster"
Mortmain license

Lyngebrok (P. R. Feb. 10, 1355, p. 168)
"out of compassion for the great poverty and indigence at present time"
Mortmain property

Henton (P. R. Oct. 5, 1355, p. 282)
"for want of laborers and servants since the time of the last pestilence, the greater part of their land had been uncultivated and they cannot find servants"
Statutete of Laborers relaxed

Fourneys (P. R. Oct. 3, 1355, p. 308)
"unable to raise food at home"
Permission to bring corn from Ireland for sustenance

St. Bartholomew, Wynchelsea (P. R. Aug. 6, 1355, p. 279)
"out of compassion for the state of the hospital, which since the pestilence is depressed in many ways"
Pardon of rent

Ministre, Cornwall (P. R. June 20, 1355, p. 252, 247)
"out of compassion for the estate of the prior, who for the poverty of his priory . . . is in such miserable depression that the rents and produce scarce suffice for the sustenance of him and his fellow monks"
Pardon of farm, exemption for future

Horton, Pritewell, Pontefract, Farle, Lenton, St. Andrews, Northampton, Holme, St. Helens, Isle of Wight (P. R. May 5, 1355, p. 217)
"at the supplication of the abbot of Cluny"
Pardon for arrears and deductions of farm

Lodres (P. R. Nov. 9, 1355, p. 305)
"in arrears"
Pardon and extension of time

Derby (Cl. R. Nov. 20, 1355, p. 164)
"possessions hardly sufficient for maintenance of the prior"
Pardon of farm

Hospital of Lincoln (P. P. I: 273)
"wanted hospitality is not a little increased"
Indulgences to donors

St. Augustine, Canterbury (P. P. I: 281)
"wanted hospitality is not a little increased"
Indulgences to visitors

Malton, Chikesond, Sempynham (P. R. Nov. 17, 1356, p. 474)
"in relief of the estate of . . ."
Pardon of tenths

Wynteneye (P. R. Dec. 1, 1356, p. 481)
"in consideration of many subsidies"
Nolumus protection

St. Mary Magdalene, Dorset (P. R. March 20, 1356, p. 351)
"who had not whereof to live unless relieved by charity"
Rogamus protection

Stratford Say (P. R. July 20, 1356, p. 420)
"the farm is in arrears, the church and house of priory threaten to fall in ruins and he has already sold the priory wood to pay his farm so that there is now nothing to pay the farm with"
Pardon of arrears exemption from farm

Toftes (P. R. June 28, 1356, p. 409)
Nolumus protection

Dover (P. R. May 20, 1356, p. 379)
"for default of good rule is so wasted in its possessions and fallen away in its faculties that there is no relief for it but in ordering otherwise for it"
Unites with Christ's Canterbury

Beauvale (P. R. May 6, 1356, p. 368)
Nolumus protection

Egleston (P. R. May 1, 1357, p. 530)
"out of compassion for the great poverty of the abbot and convent"
Church appropriation

Durham (P. R. March 6, 1356, p. 357)
"possessions totally destroyed and wasted by the Scots and so the priory is grievously decayed in its faculties which the king bears ill"
Church appropriation

Glastyngbury (P. R. Feb. 17, 1357, p. 513)
"in consideration of many subsidies made to the king in his necessity"
Protection

Wolfricheston (P. R. Feb. 2, 1357, p. 503)
"out of compassion for the state of the priory which by various adversities is so depressed that the prior is not sufficient for the payment of the farm"
Farm exemption

Clatford (P. R. July 12, 1357, p. 578)
"on account of the late pestilence as well as of various other causes, the goods and possessions of the priory are not sufficient to find sustenance for the house and pay the farm"
Reduction of farm and exemption from other dues

Holanbrigg (P. R. Nov. 7, 1357, p. 631)
"in aid of a sustenance of the charges of the priory"
A grant of money

St. German, Cornwall (P. R. Nov. 20, 1357, p. 637)
"out of compassion for the poverty and adversity of the priory"
Restoration of forfeited lands

Rufford (P. R. Nov. 30, 1357, p. 642)
"in consideration of many subsidies made to the king"
Nolumus protection

Colme (Cl. R. Feb. 26, 1357, p. 391)
"out of compassion for the state of the priory oppressed by various adversities"
Respite of tenth

St. Thomas Martyr, Southwerk (P. P. I: 304)
"to which flock numbers of poor and sick so that the master . . . cannot support their charges without alms"
Indulgences to donors

Farlegh (P. R. July 16, 1358, p. 82)
"the faculties of the priory are scarcely sufficient to pay the said farm"
Reduction of farm

Holy Trinity, London (P. R. Nov. 14, 1358, p. 120) (June 15, 1359, p. 229)
"out of compassion for their depressed estate" "detention of rents"
Pardon of tenth

St .Bartholomew, Gloucester (P. R. May 3, 1358, p. 74)
"insufficient food and raiment are provided for brothers and sisters in these days after corrodies had been profusely distributed"
Investigating commission

Caresbrok (Cl. R. Oct. 26, 1358, p. 471)
"as his priory was so impoverished after the pestilence that its goods hardly sufficed" for the maintenance of the prior and monks and he could not levy anything of the farm due"
Pardon of arrears

Hermodesworth (Cl. R. Oct. 30, 1358, p. 472)

"out of compassion for the state of the priory which is situated near the highway leading toward London and is so impoverished by the concourse of men and almost continuous hospitality, by the burning of its houses and goods, and by diverse other misfortunes since the time of the last deadly plague in these parts"

Pardon for farm

Holy Spirit, Sandou (Cl. R. June 20, 1359, p. 574)

"as the Hospital is so slenderly endowed that its goods do not suffice for the maintenance of the master and brethren and chantries"

Pardon of tenths

St. Cross (P. R. May 8, 1359, p. 195)

"goods and faculties of the priory, whose goods and buildings are entirely thrown down from various adversities, scarcely suffice in these days for the sustenance of the prior"

Farm exemption

St. Mary's, Kirkeby (P. P. I: 351)

"the church of said priory is old and in danger of ruin"

Relaxation of penance to donors

St. Andrew, York (P. R. Oct. 25, 1360, p. 471)

"at present in a very depressed condition by various adversities, withdrawal of rents and services and threats of being sued for recovery of such"

Nolumus protection

St. Andrew, Northampton (Cl. R. Feb. 9, 1360, p. 2)

"out of compassion for the poverty of the priory" arrears equal 285 pounds

Time for payment

Ulvescroft (P. R. March 18, 1361, p. 572)

"out of compassion for the poor state of the priory and convent"

Church appropriation

Pippewell (P. R. April 28, 1361, p. 10)

"the king compassionating their depressed estate"

Extension of time for debt

Haverholm, Nocton, Catteleye (Cl. R. Nov. 29, 1361, p. 230)

"so poor that their goods are insufficient for their maintenance and the tenths"

Pardon of tenths

Merlawe (Cl. R. Feb. 26, 1361, p. 166)

"prioress has leased all her lands—out of compassion for the poverty of the prioress and convent"

King restores these

Mussenden (P. P. I: 364)

"by reason of the pestilence and other causes have suffered loss of rents and are unable to make necessary repairs"

Church appropriation

Wykes (P. R. Jan. 26, 1362, p. 154)

"the king compassionating the state of the house depressed by a great debt and other adversities"

Pardon for improper election

Wherewell (P. R. Jan. 30, 1362, p. 156)

"which is much depressed in these days"

Pardon of issues of voidances

Frompton (P. R. Oct. 22, 1362, p. 260)

"possessions so diminished by the war, the deadly pestilence, the last storm of wind and other disadvantages that the issues and emoluments are insufficient for the sustenance of the prior and convent"

License to lease

Westminster (P. R. April 12, 1362, p. 194)

"in consideration of the disadvantages suffered by the last storm as well as by other adversities, for relief and repair . . . now in ruins"

Voidance compromise

St. Sepulchre, Canterbury (Cl. R. Oct. 25, 1362, p. 364)

"out of compassion for said prioress and nuns who are in these days subject to such adversity that they have scarce means to live"

Pardon of ninths

Lewesham (Cl. R. Oct. 24, 1362, p. 370)

"out of compassion for the estate of the said prior, borne down by various misfortunes, and willing to succour and relieve the same"

Stay of subsidy and tenth

Sywardesleye (P. R. June 30, 1360, p. 436)

"out of compassion for the state of the prioress whose goods and possessions are in these days insufficient for their sustenance"

Alienation of property

St. Mary's, Wroxton (P. P. I: 402)
"chapel threatens ruin and whereas the prior and ten canons whose fruits do not exceed 100 marks cannot afford to restore it"
Indulgence to donors

St. Mary, Bethlehem, Bishop's Gate (P. P. I: 424)
"whereas their rents are only 33 shillings and they have lost many benefactors by the pestilence and their building and trees have suffered by the hurricane"
Indulgence to donors

St. Mary, Winchester (P. R. April 18, 1364, p. 485)
"which by pestilences prevailing in those parts and misrule of past presidents is now so depressed and charged with corrodies . . . that the dispersal of the nuns is probable"
Royal custody

Berurne (P. R. Feb. 5, 1364, p. 461)
"now so heavily threatened through misrule and adversity that it is threatened with total distruction and dispersal of the monks"
Protection and royal custody

Shaftesbury (P. R. Oct. 11, 1364, p. 21)
"much depressed by a tempest of wind and mortal pestilences lately prevailing in the realm"
Voidance exemption

Kingswode (P. P. I: 483)
"who are come to poverty and have to go about begging"
Oblations

St. Cross, Stanford (P. P. I: 407)
"whereas the hospital has been founded, but by wars and other mishaps it has come to nought"
Confirmation to rebuild

Séez,—Abbot (P. R. May 11, 1365, p. 110)
" 'divers arrears' . . . other creditors are suing him for recovery of debts"
Protection

II

Recognizances

			Close Rolls
1349			
St. Mary's, Southwerk	£10	Henry de Lunhales, clerk	p. 55
St. Mary's, Southwerk	£20	Roger de Chestrefeld, clerk, cancelled	p. 56
St. John, Jerusalem	£100	Richard de Chuderlegh, cancelled	p. 56
King Beaulieu	£100	John Pycot, citizen and corderer of London, cancelled	p. 64
Cumba	£200	Ralph de Stanlowe	p. 67
Matherseye	£21	Wm. de Lound John de Cotyngton, cancelled	p. 80
Bermundeseye	24M.	John Beseville, cancelled	p. 89
St. Frideswyde	£80	Ralph de Cantebrigge, citizen of London Robert de Erhethe, cancelled	p. 136
Clifford	£20	William de Dersham John Warender	p. 139
St. Frideswyde	£100	John Allin, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 152
St. Frideswyde	£50	Nicolas Sperlyng, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 152
St. Mary's, Southwerk	200M.	Walter Whithers, cancelled	p. 152
1350			
Lesnes	£60	John de Hatfeld, citizen and draper of London, cancelled	p. 201
Wymundham	£400	Anthony Bache, merchant, cancelled	p. 202
Caldewell	£40	Thomas de Sibethorp, cancelled	p. 204
Bermundeseye	£40	Robert de Guldeford, draper of London	p. 209
Colchester	£40	Edmund de Grymesby, clerk, cancelled	p. 216
Swaveseye	£20	Edmund de Grymesby	p. 216
Lesnes	£400	John de Hiltoft, citizen and goldsmith of London, cancelled	p. 224
Bermundeseye	£40	Henry de Ingelby, clerk, cancelled	p. 228
Bermundeseye	£100	Robert atte Brome, clerk	p. 238
Wymundham	£578-19-8	John de Wynggefeld, knight Thomas de Wynggefeld, cancelled	p. 239
Stratford	100M.	David de Wollore, clerk, cancelled Henry de Ingelby, clerk Thomas de Neuby, clerk	p. 242
Lylleshull	100s.	David de Wollore, clerk, cancelled	p. 242

1350			Close Rolls
Holy Trinity, London	£100	Adam Fraunceys, citizen and merchant of London	p. 243
Wilmyton	£100	Tydemannus de Lynbergh	p. 243
Beaulieu	£100	John de la Rokele, citizen and corderer of London	p. 264
St. Bartholomew P.	£40	Edmund de Grymesby, clerk, cancelled	p. 276
Coggeshale	£10	David de Wollore, clerk, cancelled	p. 276
St. Mary, Bishopsgate	£100	Adam Fraunceys Thomas de Langeton, citizen and mercer of London	p. 278
1351			
Prittewell	£20	Thomas de Stapele	p. 346
Pontefract	£66-13-4	Earl of Lancaster	p. 346
St. John, Jerusalem	£100	Roger Hillary, knight	p. 347
Tykeford	£20	Richard de Bromwyche	p. 349
Caldewell	£100	Walter de Chedyngton, citizen of London	p. 351
Bergeveny	6M.	John Gogh, clerk	p. 352
St. Mary's, Southwerk	£20	William de Newenham, clerk	p. 359
St. Mary's, Southwerk	20M.	William de Newenham, clerk	p. 359
St. Leonard	£60	Thomas de Horewold, citizen and spicer of London	p. 360
Beaulieu	£4000	Bishop of Winchester	p. 362
St. Swithun	£60	Dean of St. Paul's	p. 368
Tykeford	£50	Nicolas Sperlyng, London	p. 369
Neuburgh	400M.	John Iperlyng, merchant of Newcastle, cancelled	p. 373
Wilmyngton	£30	David de Wollore, clerk, cancelled	p. 375
St. Mary's, Merton	£120	William de Wodehalle, cancelled	p. 375
Tykeford	£100	Nicolas Sperlyng William de Budiston Bugo-Fitz-Waryn	p. 377
Tykeford	£40	Nicolas Sperlyng	p. 377
St. Mary, Bishopsgate	40M.	Alice Amerose	p. 377
Stanleye	£50	John Pynselegle, citizen of London	p. 388
Stanleye	600M. (3)	Thomas Dolsaly, citizen of London	p. 395
St. John, Colchester	£200	Stephen de Cavendissh William de Dyk	p. 395
Coumbe	£14	William de Sutham, parson	p. 396
St. Bartholomew	£20	William de Rodynton, Leicester	p. 396
Lesnes	£53-6-8	Robert Selle, clerk	p. 396
Lettele	£10	Edmund de Grymesby, clerk, cancelled	p. 399
Holy Trinity	£200	Simon Hathfeld, potter, cancelled	p. 400
Tycford	£40	John Beaufort, London	p. 404

			Close Rolls
1351			
Breuera	£28	Robert de Hungerford, knight Henry Russel, Salisbury	p. 404
Westminster	£240	Merchants of the Society of Malbaill	p. 405
Stratford at Bowe	£200	Adam de Fraunceys, citizen of London	p. 406
1352			
St. Mary's, Thame	£100	Earl of Huntingdon, cancelled	p. 463
Eynesham	£140	Thomas Brun and his wife, citizen and wool-maker of London	p. 464
Hurle	£100	John Husebond, citizen and cornmonger of London	p. 456
St. Denys	£50	Henry Russel of Salisbury	p. 477
Wynchecombe	13M.	Prior of Lanthon, cancelled	p. 479
Lesnes	£200	Richard de Thoresby, clerk, cancelled	p. 479
Lesnes	100M.	Stephen de Cavendissh, citizen and draper of London	p. 481
Stanlegh	£70	John Pynselegle, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 482
Pershore	£20	William de Tudenham, citizen of London	p. 487
Leicester	£200	Duke of Lancaster	p. 488
Thetford Monachorum	£100	William de Middelton, cancelled	p. 488
Castelacre	£400	Walter Marescall, chaplain Richard Double, citizen and fishmonger of London	p. 488
St. John, Jerusalem	500M.	Walter Neel, citizen and cornmonger of London John Blaunche, citizen and vintner of London, cancelled	p. 493
Westminster	£45	Geoffrey Bebury William de Kelleseye	p. 494
Bynedon	£160	John de la Hale, knight	p. 497
Okeburn	800M.	Henry de Greystok William Peek, clerks	p. 502
St. Mary, Bishopsgate	£300	Edward Chaumberlyn, clerk John Piel, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 505
St. Bartholomew	40M.	Richard de Thoresby, clerk	p. 520
Lesnes	£400	Richard de Berkyng, citizen and draper of London	p. 523
1353			
Bermundesey	50M.	Richard de Wyght, cancelled	p. 588
Stanlegh	£140	John Pynselegle, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 589
Sulby	£20	Henry Grene	p. 590

1353			Close Rolls
Malton	£150	Robert de Ampelford Roger de Marton, ironmonger of York, cancelled	p. 593
Eynesham	£400	Thomas de Baddeby, clerk, cancelled	p. 602
	£1000	Edmund de Bereford, cancelled	p. 604
	£1000	William de Shareshuff, cancelled	p. 606
Thame	£100	Robert Wendout, cancelled	p. 606
St. Mary, Cripelgate	£40	Robert de Marny, knight, cancelled	p. 617
Lesnes	£60	John de Cicestria, citizen and goldsmith of London, cancelled	p. 617
Suleby	£200	Adam Fraunceys John Pyel, citizens of London	p. 617
St. John, Colchester	£20	Stephen de Cavendissh	p. 619
Cokhull	40M.	Geoffrey de Welveford, clerk	p. 621
St. Bartholomew P.	£40	David de Wollore, clerk	p. 623
Arundel	£1000	Master Adam de Houton, clerk, cancelled	p. 623
Lesnes	£12-10	William de Dersham, cancelled	p. 604
1354			
Eynesham	£50	John de Herdewyk, cancelled	p. 54
Eynesham	£50	Simon Power, cancelled	p. 54
St. Bartholomew P.	£20	Richard de Thoresby, clerk	p. 54
Tuttebury	£60	John Vassour, clerk	p. 55
Lesnes	£500	Adam Franceys Thomas de Langeton, clerk, cancelled	p. 57
Tupholm	50s.	John de Codynton, clerk	p. 66
Theford	£10	Richard de Norwico, clerk, cancelled	p. 68
Torkeseye	£20	Simon de Gaynesburgh, clerk	p. 68
St. Frideswide	2M.	Robert de Newenham, clerk	p. 75
St. Bartholomew	£100	Simon de Hathfeld, potter of London, cancelled	p. 77
Coggeshale	£77	Robert Sewale, merchant of Ipswich, cancelled	p. 77
Arundel	1000M.	Master William de Carreu and wife, clerk	p. 78
Caldewell	£100	John Barbour, vicar	p. 78
St. Giles	£200	William de Ilkeston, parson William de Sallowe, draper, London	p. 83
Huntingdon	£20	David Wollore Henry de Ingelby Michael de Ravendale, clerks, cancelled	p. 91

1354			Close Rolls
Okebourne	£40	Michael de Ravensdale William de Haukesworth, clerks, cancelled	p. 83
Ellerton	£200	Master William de Fenton	p. 91
Lesnes	£34-13-4	Master Richard de Sahan	p. 95
St. Bartholomew	£40	John Mayu, cancelled	p. 99
1355			
Thame	£11-13-4	William de Hilton John Wyndow John James	p. 178
Stanlegh	£80	John Pynselegel, citizen	p. 183
Cookhull	£200	Robert de Utilicote, parson	p. 186
Lesnes	£68	William de Teudenham	p. 199
St. Mary, Bishopsgate	£200	William de Ledwell, chaplain John Permay, citizen, cancelled	p. 203
Hickelyng	£40	Richard de Thoresby, clerk, cancelled	p. 206
St. Saviour, Bermundeseye	£100	Edmund de Acre, clerk, cancelled	p. 208
Kirkestall	£100	William de Wynterton, clerk, cancelled	p. 225
Bermundeseye	£9	William Tank, cancelled	p. 239
1356			
Hurle	£32	Robert Pycot, citizen and draper of London	p. 303
Hurle	£6	Hugh de Causton, cornmonger, cancelled	p. 306
Whiteby	100s.	David de Wollore, clerk, cancelled	p. 306
Bermundeseye	£20	Thomas de Neuton John de Littyngton Robert de Keteveyngham, parsons	p. 312
Thrulegh	£92-10	John de Clynton Thomas de Murton	p. 321
Bermundeseye	£100	John de Cobham, knight	p. 328
1357			
Lesnes	£100	Robert Wendout	p. 334
St. Bartholomew P.	£200	John de Burstall and wife, citizen and vintner	p. 335
Eynesham	£20	John de Nessager, chaplain	p. 393
Sele	£40	William de Gategang, parson, cancelled	p. 394
St. Nicolas, Arundel	£24	Nicolas Carreu	p. 404
St. John, Jerusalem	600M.	John de Dyngele, cancelled	p. 417
Huntingdon	£10	David de Wollore Michael de Ravendale	p. 422
Latton	50M.	John de Burstall, citizen and vintner of London	p. 422

			Close Rolls
1354			
St. Mary's, Bishopsgate	£40	John de Bickelsworth	p. 430
Lesnes	£200	Richard Smelt, citizen of London, cancelled	p. 431
1358			
Boxle	£80	Bishop of Rochester, cancelled	p. 434
Thame	£20	Robert de Wyke William de Styandeby	p. 487
Neubo	20M.	Simon de Alyington, parson, cancelled	p. 489
	6M.	Henry de Codynton, clerk	
Stonele	£60	Robert de Pipe	p. 494
	£60	Nicolas Pipe	
	£60	Thomas Hockele, cancelled	p. 498
Burton-St. Lazarus	£4	William de Haukesworth, clerk	p. 509
Lesnes	£80	John Bernard Thomas la Botiller	p. 512
St. Mary's, Stratford	£200	Richard de Chadeslee, clerk	p. 512
St. John, Colchester	£44	Master Clement de Rumburgh, parson	p. 518
Sele	100M.	Montezinus de Bagesano	p. 522
Lesnes	£165	Guy de Brien, knight John Seys, clerk	p. 522
St. Frideswide	50M.	Robert de Louches	p. 529
	£20	Bishop of London John de Cantebrigg, citizen of London	p. 529
1359			
Thame	£8	John de Pokelyngton	p. 612
Sautre	£12	Richard de Ravenser, clerk Michael de Ravendale, clerk	p. 628
Stonleye	£100	Lawrence Harcourt, Adam Stok John Hockele, Thomas Hockele William Wodestok, Henry Pype Isabel Heynes, Eleanor Seymur	p. 106
Basyngwerk	£8	Richard de Ravensere, clerk	p. 122
Frompton	£300	Guy de Brien, knight	p. 125
St. Bartholomew	£493-6-8	Thomas Frauncies, citizen of London	p. 150
1361			
Burstall	£50-13-4	Richard de Ravenser, clerk	p. 243
West Ravendale	£57-6-4	Richard de Ravenser David de Wollore Michael de Ravendale	p. 243
Stonleye	£300	John Ragon, knight	p. 257
Tuttebury	20M.	Richard de Tessynton, clerk	p. 261
Lesnes	£40	Robert Paris, ferron and citizen of London	p. 287

			Close Rolls
1361			
St. Bartholomew	£400	Richard de Sharnelsford, cancelled	p. 301
1362			
Holy Trinity, London	£60	Richard Dukesey and wife	p. 400
Stonleye	£300	John Bray, Isabel Heynus, her two sons, her daughter and William Stokton	p. 400
Stonleye	£80	Thomas Blakendale, Richard Ymayn, William Stokton and Henry Pipe	p. 414
Evesham	1000M.	John le Frenshe, cancelled	p. 427
Whalley	£40	David de Wollore Thomas de Neuby, clerks, cancelled	p. 429
	6M.	Michael de Ravendale David de Wollore Thomas de Neuby, cancelled	p. 435
Sautre	£44	Abbot of Bonrepos	
	40M.	Abbot of Bonrepos, cancelled	p. 437

Incumbents of Representative Monasteries

Incumbent	Intercessor	Status	Provisions	Present Holding	Ref.
Abbey of St. Edmund's					
Thomas Thyrop	Arts. Fac. Oxford	Clerk, M. A.	Benefice		Pap. Pet. 1-14
Walter Tramleyn	Direct		" £30		(I:160)
Ralph Holbeck	Arch. D. Huntingdon	M. A; B. C. L.	"		(I:212)
William Rochele	King's chamberlain		" £30	Church	(I:253)
Robert Wossingsite	Mem. of Bishop's household		" £30	"	(I:277)
Thomas Bundy	Bishop of Norwich	"his clerk"	"	Perpetual chaplaincy	(I:285)
Richard Mundevill	Prince of Wales	his clerk	"	Rector	(I:301)
Thomas Hornigsberth	Fac. Cambridge	L. C. L.	" £40	Rural deanery	(I:407)
John Dunwich	Fac. Cambridge	B. C. L.	" £30	Expectancy	(1:407)
Abbey of Glastonbury					
John Tulborgi	Arts. Fac. Oxford	clerk, M. A.	"		(I:148)
William Chesterton	Arch. D. Huntingdon	B. C. L.	" 30M.		(L:211)
Robert Askeby	Robert Askeby	kinsman	" 30M.		
Walter Moreyn	Ab. of Glastonbury	"His clerk" M. A.	Benefice		(I:282)
John Umfray	Direct		"		(I:301)
John Knave	Earl of March	"his clerk"	"	church	(I:302)
William Bere	Bish. Tusculum	"mem. household"	" £15	"	(I:360)
Robert Clyst	Masters, Oxford	M. A.	"		(I:404)
William Gotham	Masters, Oxford	priest B. T. H.	" £40		(I:405)
William Westmere	Direct		"		(I:428)
Walter Tanner	Direct	poor clerk	"		(I:433)
Henry Bitton	Robert Askeby	"his clerk"	life benefice	church	(I:222)
Mary's, York					
William Haukesworth	Conv. Oxford	priest, M. A.	Benefice 30M.		(I:146)
Richard Rotee	"Ambass. of Prince of Wales"		" 20M.		(I:164)
John Lybert	Abbot of St. Alban's		" 20M.		(I:172)
Richard Beverlaes	Abbot of St. Alban's		Benefice 40M.		(I:198)
Robert Witteby	Arch. D. Huntingdon	B. A. Student	"		(I:212)
John Appelby	John Grey, Knight	B. C. L.	" £50	Church	(I:214)
Richard Bekingham	King's secretary	perp. vic.	"	vicarage	(I:220)
Thomas Buckaton D. C. L.	Direct		" 40M.	canonry	(I:222)
Henry Bowghton	Duke of Lancaster		" £30		(I:226)
John Marton	Duke of Lancaster	"his clerk"	"		(I:275)
Thomas Bulton	Duke of Lancaster	Official of York		canonry & Prevend expectancy	(I:281)

III. Incumbents of Representative Monasteries—*Continued.*

Incumbent	Intercessor	Status	Provisions	Present Holding	Ref.
John Pray	Direct		benefice		(I:290)
John Adele	the king		"		(I:364)
Nicolas Ferity	Hugh Zouche, baron King's kinsmen	S. C. L.	" 40M.		(I:388)
William Wilton	Master's Oxford	M. S. Scholar	" 40M.	expectancy	(I:403)
Roger Sutton	Master's Cambridge	M. A.	" £30	church	(I:406)
John Carlton	Direct	"poor priest"	"		(I:427)
John Porter	Direct	"poor priest"	"	expectancy	(I:429)
Richard Appelby	Bish. Carlisle	"his kinsman"	" 40M.		(I:437)
Abbey of Peterboro					
Adam Mavesby	Wm. Mavesby	kinsman	" 30M.		(I:141)
Alan Crophill	the king	"son of knight"		expectancy	(I:164)
Simon Bate	Pr. Hops. Eng.	"his nephew"	"		(I:198)
Roger Herlaston, B. C. L.	Direct	clerk Countess Pembroke	" £50	expectancy	(I:210)
Nicolas Croxhale	Duke of Lancaster	"his chaplain and confessor	" £40	church and canonry	(I:240)
William Ovirton	Arch. D. Huntingdon	"chaplain"	" 30M.		(I:233)
Geoffrey Fairfax	Bishop of London		"	church	(I:259)
Roger Sutton	Household of the Bish. of Norwich	L. C. L.	"		(I:276)
John Maskerel	Duke of Lancaster	'his clerk"	Benefice		(I:283)
John Burton	Duke of Lancaster	"his chaplain"	"		(I:283)
Richard Daneys	Prince of Wales	"brother of a knight"	"	church	(I:292)
Richard Manndevil	Prince of Wales	"his clerk"	"	rectory	(I:295)
Roger Sutton	Auditor at papal palace			church expectancy	(L:329)
Thomas Burton	William Burton	"his nephew"	benefice £48	vicarage	(I:362)
John Shipdam	the king		"		(I:364)
Adam Ridelington	Earl of Arundel		" 20M.	chantry	(I:388)
Roger Aswardeby	Masters Oxford	M. A. Scholar	"		(I:392)
Stephen Bothe	king of France		" £60		(I:395)
Peter Johannis	Countess of Huntingdon	son of Robert Johannis	" £30		(I:404)
Thomas Fower	Direct	clerk	"		(I:448)
John Reyhan	Prince of Wales		" £60	rectory	(I:455)
John Birkhampstead	John Grey	"skilled in law"	" £40		(I:214)
Abbey of Ramsey					
Peter Daren	Prince of Wales		benefice only 21 years		(I:154)
Edward Derby	Queen Philippa			expectancy canonry	(I:156)
John Carleton	Bishop Lincoln	"his secretary"	benefice	canonry	(I:163)
Wm. Wyttleye	the king	"official of the cardinal"	" £30		(I:174)
Roger Elinydon	Arch. Huntingdon	"his brother"	"	dispensation	(I:211)
John Swinlee	Master king's infants	"his clerk"	" £50	church	(I:213)
Wm. Loghton	Arch. Huntingdon	"his companion"	" 30M.		(I:233)
Henry Attewode	"Adv. of Roman Ct."	"his chaplain"	" 30M.	chaplaincy	(I:248)
Richard Friday	King's secretary	chaplain	"		(I:249)
John Mertin	Direct	M. A. C. B. C. L.	"	church	(I:250)

III. Incumbents of Representative Monasteries—*Continued.*

Incumbent	Intercessor	Status	Provisions	Present Holding	Ref.
John Wellingbrook	Bishop of London	"his clerk"	benefice	church	(I:259)
Walter Aldeby	Bishop Norwich, B. C. L.		"	rural deanery	(I:277)
Robert Hardgay	Duke of Lancaster	"his chaplain"			(I:283)
Gregory Southwyk	University Oxford	"doctor of med."	"		(I:285)
Richard Daneys	Prince of Wales	brother of Ronald Daneys	"	church	(I:292)
John Salmesford	Direct		"		(I:351)
Richard Wistowe	Direct	"present at Roman court"	"	vicarage	(I:415)
John Penereth	Thos. Penereth	king's squire and servant student at Oxford			(I:417)
Robert Wurtham	Bishop Waterford	L. C. L.	benefice £40	church	(I:438)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The * indicates source material.

*Ambresbury, Michaelis de
Rentalia et Costumaria. Michaelis de Ambresbury et Rogeri de Ford. Ed. C. J. Elton. Somerset Record Society Publications, Vol. V, 1891.

*Avesbury, Robert of
De Gestis Miralibus Regis Edwardi Tertii. Ed., Edward Maunde Thompson, Rolls series, Lond., 1889.

*Baker, Geoffrey le
Chronicon Galfridi le Baker de Swynebroke. Ed., Edward Maunde Thompson, Oxford, 1889.

*Blomefield, Frances
Topographical History of County of Norfolk. London, 1805.

**Calender of the Close Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office.* Edw. III, Vol. II-XIV inclusive. Lond., 1898-1913.

**Calender of the Patent Rolls preserved in the Public Record Office.* Edw. III, Vol. II to XVI inclusive. Lond., 1893-1916.

**Calender of Entries in the Papal Registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland—Papal Letters,* Vols. III and IV. Ed., W. H. Bliss and C. Johnson. Lond., 1897.

**Calender of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland—Petitions to the Pope,* Vol. I. Ed., W. H. Bliss. Lond., 1896.

Capes, W. W.
The English Church in the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Centuries. Lond., 1910.

**The Charters of Endowment. Inventories and Account Rolls of the Priory of Finchale.* Ed., James Raine, Surtees Society, 1837.

*Capgrave, John. *The Chronicle of England.* Ed., Rev. F. C. Hingeston, Rolls Series, Lond., 1858.

**Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide.* Vols. I and II. Ed., Rev. S. R. Wigram, Oxford Historical Society, 1894-1896.

**Chartulary of St. John of Pontefract,* Vols. I and II. Ed., Richard Holmes, Yorkshire Archaelogical Society, Vols. XXV and XXX.

**Cartularium Monasterii de Ramesia.* Ed., W. H. Hart and Ponsonby Lyons, Rolls series, 1884.

**Charters of Selborne Priory.* Ed., W. D. Macray, Hampshire Record Society Publication, 1st series 1891, second series 1894.

*Chaucer, Geoffrey
The Complete Works. Ed., W. W. Skeat. Oxford, 1894-1897.

**Chronicon Monasterii de Abingdon.* Ed., Rev. J. Stevenson, Rolls series, Vol. II, Lond., 1858.

*Burton, Thomas of
Chronica Monasterii de Melsa . . . auctore Thoma de Burton, Abbata. Ed., Edward A Bond, 3 vols., Rolls series, 1866-1868.

**Collectanea Anglo-Premonstratensia.* Ed., Francis Aidan Gasquet. Camden, third series, Vols. X and XII, 1906.

**The Correspondence Inventories and Account Rolls of the Priory of Coldingham.* Ed., James Raine, Surtees Society, 1841.

Creighton, Charles

History of Epidemics in Britain. Cambridge, 1891.

Cunningham, William

The Growth of English Industry and Commerce. 5th ed. 1910.

Davenport, Francis Gardiner

A Classified List of Printed Original Materials for English Manorial and Agrarian History during the Middle Ages. Boston, 1894.

"*The Decay of Villeinage in East Anglia.*" Royal Historical Society, New series, Vol. XIV.

*Duckett, Sir G. F.

Charters and Records of Cluny, 1888.

Dugdale, William. *Monasticon Anglicanum.* Lond., 1846.

**Eulogium: chronicon ab orbe condito usque ad annum Domini 1366.* . . . Ed., Frank Scott Hayden, Vol. III, Rolls series, Lond., 1863.

**Eynsham Cartulary.* Ed., Rev. H. E. Salter, Vols. I and II. Oxford Historical Society, Vols. XLIX and LI.

**Feodary of Glastonbury Abbey.* Ed., Rev. F. W. Weaver, Somerset Record Society Publications, Vol. XXVI.

**Fasciculi Zizaniorum.* Ed., Rev. W. W. Shirley, Rolls series, Lond., 1858.

Gasquet, Francis Aidan

The Black Death, Lond., 1908.

Parish Life in Mediaeval England. 1906.

**Mappa Mundi*

Gervasii Centuarensis opera. Ed., William Stubbs, Rolls series, 1880.

Gross, Charles

The Sources and Literature of English History from the earliest times to about 1485, New York, 1900.

**Bishop Hatfield's Survey,* Ed., Rev. William Greenwell, Surtees Society, Vol. XXXII, 1857.

*Higden, Ranulphi

Polychronicon Ranulphi Higden Monachi Cestrensis. Ed., C. Babington, Rolls series, 1865.

**Histora et Cartularium Monasterii Gloucestriae.* Ed., W. H. Hart, Rolls series, Lond., 1868.

**Historical Papers and Letters from the Northern Registers.* Ed., James Raine, Rolls series, 1878.

**The Black Book of Hexham.* Surtees Society, Vols. XLIV and XLVI.

**Inquisitiones Post Mortem for the County of Worcester.* Ed., J. Willis Bund. Worcester Historical Society Publications, 1909.

Jessopp, Augustus

The Coming of the Friars and other Historic Essays. Lond., 1888.

*Knighton, Henry

Chronicon Henrici Knighton, monachi Leycestrensis. Ed., J. R. Lumby. Rolls series, Lond., 1889-1895.

*Langland, William
Vision of William concerning Piers the Plowman. Ed., W. W. Skeat. Oxford, 1886.
Little, A. G.
"The Black Death in Lancashire," E. H. R. Vol. V.
*Literae Cantuarienses.
Letter Books of the Monastery of Christ Church Canterbury. Ed. J. D. Sheppard, Rolls series, 1887.
Longman, William
The History of the Life and Times of Edward III. Lond., 1869.
**Lay Subsidy Rolls.* Ed., John Amphlett, Worcester Historical Society Publications, 1899-1902.
Moore, Margaret F.
Two Select Bibliographies of Medeaeval Historical Study. Lond., 1912.
**The Newminster Cartulary*, Surtees Society, Vol. LXVI.
**Obedientiary Rolls of St. Swithun's*, Winchester. Ed., G. W. Kitchen, Hampshire Record Society Publications, Vol. VII, 1892.
Palmer, L. Foster
"Pestilences, Their Influence on the Destiny of Nations as shown in the History of the Plague. Royal Historical Society," New series, Vol. 1.
Putnam, Bertha Haven
The Enforcement of the Statutes of laborers during the first decade after the Black Death. Columbia University Studies, Vol. XXXII, 1908.
Ramsay, Sir James H.
The Genesis of Lancaster, Oxford, 1913.
**Registrum Johannis de Taillak episcopi Herefardensis.* Ed., J. H. Parry, Canterbury and York Society, 1912.
**Registrum Malmesburiense.* Ed., J. S. Brewer and C. T. Martin, Rolls series, 1880.
**Registrum Palatinum Dunelmense.* Ed., Sir Thomas Duffus Hardy, Rolls series, 1878.
**Registrum Radulphi de Salopia.* Ed., T. Scott Holmes, Somerset Record Society Publications, Vols. IX and X.
**Registrum Sede Vacante.* Ed., J. Willis Bund, Worcester Historical Society Publications, 1893-97.
**Religious and Secular Houses of Yorkshire.* Ed., W. P. Baildon, Yorkshire Archaeological Society Publications, Vol. XVII, 1895.
Rogers, J. E. Thorold
A History of Agriculture and Prices in England, Oxford, 1866. "England before and after the Black Death," *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. III.
*Sharpe, Reginald R.
Calendar of Wills—Court of Husting, Lond., 1889
*Rymer, Thomas
Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae. . . . Lond., 1727.
Seebohm, Frederic
"The Black Death and Its Place in English History," *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. II.
"The Population of England before the Black Death," *Fortnightly Review*, Vol. IV.
**Statutes of the Realm*, Vol. I
**Survey of 1320-1346.* Ed., John Harland, Chetham Society Publications 1848.
*Tanner, Thomas
Notitia Monastica. . . . 1744

Tout, T. F.
The Political History of England, Vol. III. Lond., 1905.
Trail, H. D.
Social England, Vol. II. Ed., Lond., 1909-04.
Trevelyan, George Macaulay
England in the Age of Wycliffe, New York, 1899.
*Twysden, Roger
Historiae Anglicanae Scriptores. Lond., 1652.
The Victoria Counties History of England,
Berks
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss E. C. Lodge, Vol. II
Bedford
Ecclesiastical History, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Buckingham
Ecclesiastical History, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Cumberland
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. James Wilson, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. James Wilson, Vol. II
Dorset
Ecclesiastical History, Miss M. C. Calthrop, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Miss M. C. Calthrop, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss M. C. Fripp, Miss Phyllis Wragge, Vol. II
Derby
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Mrs. J. H. Lander, Vol. II
Durham
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. H. Gee, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Miss M. Cornford, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Fred Bradshaw, Vol. II
Essex
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, J. H. Round, Vol. II
Religious Houses, R. C. Fowler, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss N. E. MacMunn, Vol. II
Gloucester
Ecclesiastical History, Miss Rose Graham, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Miss Rose Graham, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss Ruth Butler, Vol. II
Hampshire and Isle of Wight
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Lancashire
Religious Houses, Prof. James Tait, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss Alice Law, Vol. II

Leicester
Ecclesiastical History, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Lincoln
Religious Houses, Sister Elspeth and H. E. Little, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Rev. W. O. Massingberd, Vol. II
London
Ecclesiastical History, Miss J. J. Davis, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Miss Reddan, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. I
Middlesex
Social and Economic History, Miss Mary Tanner, Vol. II
Norfolk
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Northampton
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. R. N. Serjeantson, W. R. R. Atkins, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Nottingham
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss A. B. Chapman, Vol. II
Oxford
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. H. E. Salter, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. H. E. Salter. Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss Beatrice Lees, Vol. II
Rutland
Ecclesiastical History, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Sister Elspeth, Vol. I
Social and Economic History, Miss Moffat, Vol. I
Stafford
Social and Economic History, Miss Mildred Spencer, Vol. I
Suffolk
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Surrey
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. II
Somerset
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. T. Scott Holmes, Vol. II
Religious Houses, Rev. T. Scott Holmes, Vol. II
Social and Economic History, Miss Gladys Bradford, Vol. II
Warwick
Ecclesiastical History, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Rev. J. C. Cox, Vol. I
Social and Economic History, Miss Mary Dormer-Harris, Vol. I
Worcester
Ecclesiastical History, J. Willis Bund, Vol. I
Religious Houses, Miss Locke, Miss Calthrop, A. G. Little, Vol. I

Yorks
Ecclesiastical History, A. H. Thompson, Vol. III
Religious Houses, T. M. Fallow, J. Salloway, L. F. Salzmann, A. G. Little, Vol. III
Social and Economic History, Miss Maude Sellers, Vol. III

Vinogradoff, Paul
Oxford Studies in Social and Legal History, Vol. I, Oxford, 1909

*Walsingham, Thomas
Gesta Abbatum Monasterii St. Albani a Thoma Walsingham. Ed., H. T. Riley, Rolls series, 1867.
Historia Anglicana, Ed., H. T. Riley, Rolls series, 1863.

**The Whitby Cartulary*, Surtees Society, Vols. LXIX and LXXII

*Wilkins
Concilia Magnae Britanniae et Hiberniae. 4 vols., Lond., 1737.

**Wiltshire Inquisitiones post mortem returned unto the Court of Chancery in the reign of King Edward III*, abstracted by Ethel Stokes, The British Record Society, 1914.

*Wood, Anthony
Survey of the Antiquities of the City of Oxford. Ed., Andrew Clark, Oxford, 1890.

*Wyclif, John
Select English Works of Wyclif, Thomas Arnold, Oxford, 1869-71.

INDEX

Alien Priories....18, 25, 27, 28, 29, 40, 53, 60
Annuities....57
Appeals for Assistance to King....38
Appropriated Churches....2, 5, 53, 54
Chantries....5, 47, 53
Chaplains....61
Coast Guard Service....30
Contributors to Religious Institutions....47, 48
Corrodies....4, 44
Custodianship....28, 53, 66
Creditors....55, 56
Distraints upon Monasteries....56
Distribution of Monastic Properties....8
Fees of Vacancies....34
Floods in the Monasteries....33
Hospitals....4, 67
Hospitality of Monasteries....5
Inexperience....68, 69
Judgments against Monasteries....40, 55, 56
Lawlessness against Monasteries....48, 49
Location of Monasteries....3, 4
Manor Chapels....2, 61
Misrule in Monasteries....68, 69
Mortality in Monasteries....11, 12, 13, 15, 16
Mortmain Licenses....42, 43
Nobility and Benefices....64
Pensions....37
Pluralities....65
Raids in the Monasteries....70
Recognizances....55
Relaxation of Conditions for Holy Orders....62, 71
Revenues of Monasteries....5, 6, 7
Royal Aid to Monasteries....42
Royal Commissions....44
Royal Institutions....13, 14, 15
Scottish Inroads upon Monasteries....32
Statute of Laborers....50, 51
Tax-collecting Monks....51, 52
Tenths....20, 21, 27, 43, 51
Treasure Monasteries....49, 50
Vacancies....17, 18, 34, 35, 36, 66
Vagabond Monks....72
War Loans from Monasteries....23, 24
Wool Subsidies from Monasteries....22, 23
Youths in Monasteries....63, 64, 71